

JESUS THE CHRIST
AND
PAUL THE APOSTLE

W. DOUGLASS REID
M.A., B.D.

214

The University of Chicago
Libraries





JESUS THE CHRIST
AND
PAUL THE APOSTLE



THE NEW
JESUS THE CHRIST
AND
PAUL THE APOSTLE

IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN CRITICISM

BY

W. DOUGLASS REID, M.A., B.D.

SENIOR MODERATOR, SENIOR EXHIBITIONER, DOWNES
PRIZEMAN, ETC., TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN;
SOMETIME PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL
HISTORY AT CHESHUNT COLLEGE

London

A. BROWN & SONS, LIMITED

5 FARRINGDON AVENUE, E.C.

AND AT HULL AND YORK

1915

Y11000 INT
70 Y11000
Y11000: 000000

BS 3650

Z7 R3

453770

SOLI DEO GLORIA

PREFATORY NOTE

MY original intention was to discuss simply the doctrine of the Person of Christ in the Pauline Epistles. The scope has, however, been unavoidably enlarged in the course of preparation, so that my endeavour now practically embraces a study of the Apostle in all his relations with the Master. It therefore seemed to me that the present title, although it may be regarded as involving more than is actually dealt with, would be more appropriate, and indicate not unfairly the scope of the essay. Students may, I hope, find the references and bibliography of some service, though not complete, as I have had to work at a distance from good libraries.

BEVERLEY,

November, 1914.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
ANALYSIS	xi
CHAP. I. MODERN CRITICISM	I
II. SOURCES	24
III. PAUL AND HIS ENVIRONMENT ..	49
IV. PAUL THE CHRISTIAN	71
V. PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF JESUS ..	86
VI. THE RELATION BETWEEN JESUS AND PAUL	128
REFERENCES TO LITERATURE ..	141
BIBLIOGRAPHY	161
INDEX	169

ANALYSIS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
PRESENT DAY UNCERTAINTY, SPECIALLY IN RELIGION	
ONE CAUSE, CRITICISM OF THE POSITION OF JESUS	
THE CHRIST AND THE RELIGION HE FOUNDED..	2
OUR PURPOSE, TO EXAMINE THE RESULTS OF CRITICISM	
IN REGARD TO THE RELATIONS OF JESUS AND	
PAUL	3
I.—MODERN CRITICISM :—	
Some defects, specially false presuppositions ..	5
(a) Materialistic Monism	6
(b) Idealistic Monism	7
(c) The elimination of the supernatural.. ..	9
(d) Miracles have not occurred	10
(e) Jesus merely a man like ourselves	12
Criticism and Inspiration :—	
The functions of Criticism	17
The nature of Inspiration	20
Their relation	21
Criticism and Tradition	21
II.—SOURCES :—	
Classification	24
Secular—specially Tacitus and Josephus	24
Importance of Tacitus	25
The silence of Josephus	28
Non-canonical Christian sources	29
Canonical :—	
The testimony of "believers," its value	30
<i>Paul's Letters</i> :—	
Authenticity and genuineness	32
Order of writing	33
<i>The Acts of the Apostles</i> :—	
Authorship and date	36
<i>The Synoptic Gospels</i> :—	
Basis in Oral tradition	37
Influence of "tendency" in	
Mark	38
Luke	40
Matthew.. .. .	42

ANALYSIS

	PAGE
<i>The Gospel of John</i> :—	
Romance or history ?	43
The "spiritual" Gospel	44
<i>Recent theories of "origins"</i> :—	
The Jesus-cult theory, etc.	45
III.—PAUL, AND HIS ENVIRONMENT :—	
Not a mere "spermologos"	49
His use of the Old Testament and current Rabbinical Literature	50 ✓
Influence of "Hellenism"	51
" Stoicism	53
" Plato	53
" Alexandrianism	54
" Philo	54
" the "Mystery-Religions"	55
Other elements in his environment :—	
A Jew	57
A Roman Citizen	57
Pre-Christian relations with Jesus and His followers	58
Did he ever see Jesus ?	59
Knowledge of Jesus implied in his letters	62
Chronology of his life	64
Dates of his conversion and death	65
The man who was converted	66
IV.—PAUL THE CHRISTIAN :—	
Starting point—the Messianic Hope	72
Paul's conception	76
His difficulty in the Apostles' doctrine of Jesus as Messiah, the Resurrection	76
The experience near Damascus and the change it made	77
The one whom he saw—not merely "the Christ," but "Jesus the Christ"	77
The "real presence"	79
Not merely "vision," but spiritual experience	79
His "universalism"	81
What made him an Apostle of Jesus the Christ	82
Not merely an "apokalyptiker"	82
" a "theologian"	83
" an "ethical teacher"	84
V.—PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF JESUS :—	
His preaching	86
Is there theological development in his letters ?	87
The really human Jesus	89
Not docetic	90

ANALYSIS

	PAGE
Not "impersonal"	91
The sinlessness	92
The teaching	92
His contribution to our knowledge not large; the reasons why	93
The same emphasis on the higher element by the other primitive Christians	94
The "something more"	94
The " <i>Christ</i> "	95
The vicarious sufferer	95
The significance of Christ's death	96
Paul's experience of its saving power	97
The resurrection of Jesus	98
The nature of the Risen Christ	99
The power of Christ's resurrection	101
Effect of this in determining his conception of the Christ	102
The " <i>Lord</i> "	104
The "value of God"	106
In what sense Paul regarded Him as God	106
The Pre-existence :—	
Taken for granted	107
Origin of the idea	108
The " <i>Son</i> " :—	
Meaning of "Son of God"	109
"Ethical" sonship	111
"Spiritual" sonship	112
The "heavenly man"	113
The "subordination"	115
"Ideal" sonship	116
Pre-existence and Kenosis	117
Richer concept in the letters of the Captivity	118
Influence of Alexandrianism	119
"Firstborn of all creation"	121
The recapitulation	122
Climax in Philip. ii. 5-11	124
The essential point	127
VI.—THE RELATION BETWEEN JESUS AND PAUL :—	
The Master's own conception of Himself	129
His claims	130
The conception of the other Apostles	133
The religion of Jesus	134
What He taught	134
Paul has understood Jesus best	136
Paul has not altered Christianity	138



JESUS THE CHRIST

AND

PAUL THE APOSTLE

CHAPTER I

MODERN CRITICISM

THE most prominent characteristic of the present day is its want of sureness. In spite of the advances of science with its claims to certainty, the vast majority of men and women who try to do any serious thinking find themselves confronted with a shifting of the old landmarks, an uprooting of the old foundations, which have made it not merely difficult, but practically impossible to find any sure basis on which to rest either faith or action. The task set before themselves by the authors of *Lux Mundi* nearly five and twenty years ago, of "succouring a distressed faith" remains to-day as urgent, if not more pressing now than then, in spite of the almost innumerable attempts to accomplish it. We venture to think it is more pressing, for there is a spirit of anarchy abroad,

JESUS AND PAUL

of disregard of law and contempt for order, invading circles which until recently have been regarded as the special preserves of those principles ; and which can only be accounted for by the fact that humanity has lost its moorings, and is incapable of saying at present where safe anchorage is to be found. This is specially noticeable in the sphere of religion, and it is there of specially grave import, from the fact that religious truth used at least to be regarded as the pillar and ground of all other truth ; the sure foundation from which men could and did build up their conceptions of life, and how it was to be best lived. That, with many, is not the case to-day.

For nearly 150 years now, since the publication of the Wolfenbüttel fragments¹ in 1778 the subject of the position of Jesus Christ and the religion He founded has been agitated with increasing vehemence, and if we grant that the matter remained almost quiescent until the publication by D. F. Strauss of the first edition of his *Leben Jesu* in 1835, we have a period of almost eighty years in which the process of examination has been proceeding with ever growing keenness and acrimony ; and the question inevitably suggests itself whether the time past should not have sufficed for examination, and whether we may not now hope for something more helpful and practical ; whether we have not reached a stage when criticism may be relegated

MODERN CRITICISM

to its very necessary, but still very distinctly limited sphere of examination ; and we may be able with some hope of success to undertake the happier task of saying what things accepted in the past may still be accepted ; what new facts if any have been brought to light, and what new conclusions they involve.

We propose here briefly to examine the results of these eighty years of criticism in regard to the relations between Jesus and His greatest apostle, so that we may, if possible, see what may now be accepted as the truth about them.

The question rings out to-day with an insistence and earnestness never surpassed since the great days of controversy in the fourth and fifth centuries, What think ye of the Christ ? Whose son is He ? Careful examination of the sources of the creeds has shown that there has been a multitude of forces at work in producing the standard forms of belief, forces of very varying value ; and the task is urgent upon those who believe that within the husk there still lies a kernel of inestimable worth of seeking to distinguish aright between kernel and husk, that the things that are not shaken may remain. Certainly all inquirers do not seem to have been actuated by this motive. Some² seem to have been inspired by bitter hatred of ecclesiastical tyranny and fraud, others by the iconoclastic desire to destroy objects of veneration simply because they are venerable ; but it is probable

JESUS AND PAUL

that the vast majority of those who undertake the work of criticism are actuated by a real desire to find and follow truth, although it must be confessed that the almost infinite variety displayed in the results³ makes it very difficult to credit such a supposition. Such an amazing variety of result naturally raises questions as to the value of the instrument employed, and one of the first things that strikes an unprejudiced observer is the very large amount of subjectivity displayed by many workers, and the astonishing absurdities in which its use lands some of them sometimes. Large numbers of these are given by Dr. Knowling,⁴ Dr. Shaw,⁵ and other⁶ apologists, while Dr. Conybeare⁷ for the Rationalist Press Association trenchantly exposes the innumerable absurdities of Drews, Jensen, J. M. Robertson and W. B. Smith. The necessary inference is that the methods employed by many of the critics must have in them something that is vicious, and we find this constantly asserted even by critics of one another. It is essentially necessary then to distinguish between criticism and criticism, between an examination which works by methods and plans which have won general acceptance as applied to other subjects, and uses them with modesty and discretion, and a criticism which carries the force of individual opinion to an untenable extreme, and uses critical methods with little or no consideration as to their real applicability to the particular

MODERN CRITICISM

matter under review. The sound position has been put remarkably well by Dr. Robert Scott,⁸ "The requirement of the critic of the Epistles or Gospels is, not imagination loaded with extensive learning, but sure vision cognisant of truth and sensitive to difference. Such vision presupposes cautious examination and wise restraint."

Presuppositions.—But the evil does not lie merely in the employment of wrong methods or in the wrong use of right methods ; quite as much, perhaps more of the extravagances that are so really deplorable spring from false or at least unwarranted presuppositions. Our presuppositions⁹ are like lenses which may either magnify or minimise every subject of thought and discussion ; or if coloured, may altogether alter the appearance of any matter for consideration. That we must all in the last resort rest upon presuppositions will probably be admitted by all who take the trouble to think things through. Even Kant, who endeavoured so strenuously and, as he himself thought, succeeded so admirably, in banishing all knowledge of ultimate realities, had to postulate as presuppositions of all truly moral life, the reality of God, of freedom and of immortality. Of course, some of those who have come after him have, as they think, improved upon him in this respect ; and these great realities are now widely rejected under the plea that we must reject the supernatural. They are, we are

JESUS AND PAUL

told¹⁰ merely creatures of imagination conjured up by designing priests for the purpose of keeping mankind in bondage ; bogies with nothing real behind them ; and there is not a single article in the creeds which can be regarded as having any legitimate claim to the reasonable attention, much less the devout loyalty of intelligent men and women.

Häckel says : " We must reject what is called 'revelation,' the poetry of faith that affirms the discovery of truth in a supernatural fashion without the assistance of reason. And, since the entire structure of the Judæo-Christian religion, like that of the Mohammedan and Buddhistic, rests on these so-called revelations, and these mystic fruits of the imagination directly contradict the clear results of empirical research, it is obvious that we shall only attain to a knowledge of the truth by the rational activity of genuine science, not by the poetic imagining of a mystic faith."¹¹ The "world-view" he reaches by this method is a monism, almost if not purely materialistic, the "soul" being merely a physiological abstraction like "assimilation" or "generation" ; the "psyche" a collective idea of all the psychic functions of protoplasm ; although he would probably not accept the view attributed to him by Runze,¹² that "every atom has a soul ; not only the Plastidule, but every particle of the Ether possesses feeling and will."

MODERN CRITICISM

But Häckel's, practically if not actually materialistic Monism is not the only monistic theory current now-a-days; there is also the Idealistic Monism which Drews,¹³ *e.g.*, opposes to Häckel's, but which he advocates with the same idea of getting rid of the trammels of theology and ecclesiasticism. The significance of this will be seen from his statement that "in a monistic religion, which alone is compatible with modern thought, the idea of a religious significance of Christ is not only superfluous but mischievous." The essence of this Idealistic Monism seems to be an absolute identity between the human and the Divine: "to think of the world-activity as God's activity; of mankind's development, filled with struggles and sufferings, as the story of a divine struggle and passion; of the world-process as the process of a God who in each individual creature fights, suffers, conquers and dies, so that he may overcome the limitations of the finite in the religious consciousness of man and anticipate his future triumph over all the suffering of the world."¹⁴ This absolute identity of Deity and humanity was the final conclusion of Strauss¹⁵ on whom Drews rests, and is according to Weinl,¹⁶ the essential feature in the teaching of Richard Wagner; but when pushed to its logical extreme it lands us back in the Materialistic Monism, whose most extreme advocate was probably Feuerbach, and whom Pfeiderer¹⁷ describes as on this point

JESUS AND PAUL

drawing the final consequence of the Idealistic Monism advocated by Strauss.

In our judgment neither of these forms of Monism can be accepted as a necessary presupposition of thought. We may grant to Idealistic Monism value and validity as a pious wish, as a glorious vision, as even an ideal conception¹⁸ towards the discovery of which thought should strive, but, as an ultimate belief, as a fundamental presupposition, we feel unable to give it place. Mackintosh¹⁹ puts the point succinctly: "It ought to be clear by this time that the proposed identification of the Christian faith with the ontological theory that God and man are one—God the essence of man, man the actuality of God—is an utterly hopeless enterprise which the scientific historian cannot take seriously."

Whether then, it be the materialistic Monism of Häckel or the idealistic Monism of the Neo-Hegelians, we need to emphasise the fact that experience cannot be summed up exclusively either in terms of matter or of spirit; that though the hypothesis that all we call material may ultimately be seen to be resolvable into terms of the spiritual, is not to be ruled out as inherently impossible, the time of that resolution is probably so far distant that the only course that seems open to us at present is to admit or at least postulate the existence of two worlds or spheres or sources of experience, the spiritual

MODERN CRITICISM

and the material, and the reality of the two forms of experience which cannot as yet either of them be completely expressed in terms of the other. One of the most insistent demands of many advocates of "modern world-views" is the total elimination of the supernatural as outside experience. In doing this they generally rest themselves on the conception of nature as a self-enclosed force. This has won considerable acceptance, but Wendland²⁰ says quite accurately, "Nature is uncompleted, and ever developing anew, open to influences from the human spirit, pervaded and controlled by God," and Streeter,²¹ "In Nature the unprecedented is always occurring. Upon that fact rests the possibility of evolution. The continuity of Nature does not mean that the unprecedented does not occur, but that when it does so, it appears as something organically related to what has preceded, and not as a catastrophic intrusion. The belief in Divine guidance and intervention is really essential and valuable in the popular conception of miracle, and this I would affirm, is essential to Religion."

The fact is that the conception of evolution which gave rise to the ultra rigid conception of the uniformity of nature on which the opponents of the supernatural laid such stress, has itself undergone great evolution, and the watchword of to-day is Creative Evolution,²² evolution through a force which itself gives rise to new

JESUS AND PAUL

forms of itself, to "new beginnings,"²³ "the continuous creation of what is essentially new."²⁴

All this puts an entirely different aspect on the contention that we should, as a necessary pre-supposition of all sound thinking, exclude the supernatural as inconceivable and impossible. Things which many of the advocates of this view have regarded as supernatural are now accepted by men of equal weight and authority as facts of experience, and while the anti-supernaturalists would probably now in some cases amend their definition, so as to include these in what they call the natural, it is certainly open to those who differ from them to say that their own position has been in some measure justified, and that the presence and influence of the supernatural must be recognised as definite factors in any adequate view of life.

Criticism and Miracle.—Higher criticism which lays down such canons as "the miraculous is impossible," or "miracles have not occurred and do not occur," is going beyond its province, and to reject a document otherwise well authenticated on account of the presence in it of the record of miraculous events is an abuse of the term criticism. We are inclined indeed to say that allowing for the habits of thought current at the time to which tradition assigns the Gospels, many of the records of supernatural events are just what we should have expected to find there.

MODERN CRITICISM

The authors of those records may have been mistaken in their view of some events, but the very character of the record leads us to say that we have here the statement of eye-witnesses or derived from eye-witnesses ; that this very feature is an argument for early date ; and that it shows that the documents embody a tradition which in many points carries us very near to the actual occurrence of the events they profess to record.

But were the events what the recorders thought them to be ? This question which has now been under discussion without intermission since the days of Paulus and Strauss has not as yet reached the state of final solution, but that solution lies we believe in the direction of a better definition of the term miraculous. Dr. Thompson who has gone into this matter in great detail says,²⁵ " the belief in miracles, if that word be kept, comes to mean the belief that a supernatural power works in and through natural events," and he quotes with approval the definition of Saint Yves, " a miracle is just an ordinary event in which the pious spirit and heart believe that they recognise and do in fact recognise the special act of the universal Providence ; " adding that " this recognition has nothing to do with science ; and science unable to apprehend the supernatural can say nothing against it. It is a purely religious matter." The disappointing thing is that after saying all this he adds,²⁶ " the notion

JESUS AND PAUL

that Jesus worked miracles is, we suggest, quite as inconsistent with the doctrine of the Incarnation as the idea that His body or His mind or His moral nature were not really human." The fact is that Dr. Thompson²⁷ is here working with another false presupposition that has caused much of the trouble associated with the Higher Criticism to-day—that Jesus is a man and nothing else. If by "really human" he means that, then there cannot of course be any room for miracle, but that is really begging the whole question at issue, and this fallacy vitiates the whole of his work. "History" he says, "is common experience written down, and common experience though it makes allowance for the supernatural influences and motives which play so large a part in life, subordinates them to the strictly human personalities in which it finds them at work. With personalities not strictly human it can have nothing to do." That surely is a very inadequate definition of history. History is all experience, common and uncommon, written down; and if it comes across a personality not strictly human it has to record it; and that is just what we believe the history of Jesus the Christ does. It is just this assumption that Jesus the Christ was a man just like ourselves and nothing more, that lies at the basis of so much unfruitful criticism, unfruitful because it starts from a presupposition which cuts out a large part of the facts to be accounted for, and

MODERN CRITICISM

it is just this assumption which explains a great deal of what has not unjustly been called the collapse of liberal Christianity, inasmuch as it takes away all basis for Christianity, whatever it may leave for other forms of religion. Christianity that is to remain Christianity must stand by His manhood, His perfect manhood, and *the something more*, without which His life and work cannot be understood. As a further illustration of what we mean let us quote the statement of Bousset,²⁸ "He never overstepped the limits of the purely human," which he supports by the passage which has had to do so much service in buttressing this position, the declaration to the rich young ruler²⁹ "None is good save God," thereby says Bousset (and many others agree with him) "placing himself on the side of struggling humanity." But there is another interpretation which, in our judgment, tells in an entirely opposite direction. The Master was answering this man's question "what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" and the essence of His answer is, trust me, follow me, believe what I say, and heaven shall be yours. But how could He expect the man to do that, if he saw in Him merely a carpenter and teacher of religion, even though exceptionally good and clever? To be able to implement such promises as He here makes He must be something far more, and so we can only rightly understand Him when we hear Him saying "None is good save One,

JESUS AND PAUL

God, and I am He, and therefore, only therefore, can you rely on me to do what I have promised." The declaration thus understood (and it seems to us best to explain the story) is not a denial, but an assertion of Divinity. The same criticism that we have applied to Dr. Thompson's and Bousset's work seems to us applicable to the famous argument of P. W. Schmiedel in his article on the Gospels in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*,³⁰ around which so much controversy has arisen, and which has, he fairly complains, been often grievously misunderstood. He did not, he says, intend to say that "the nine pillar-passages were the only credible ones in the gospels; rather do they guarantee not only their own contents but much more; one may hold as credible all else which agrees with these and is in other respects not open to suspicion," and so he would include³¹ as highly probable "almost the whole of the purely religious and moral teaching of Jesus, including most of the parables as well as much that is said about various journeyings of Jesus, about works of healing of the kind that are known to happen even at present, about his entry into Jerusalem, his cleansing of the temple, about his passion and death." Nevertheless, although we cannot accept the criticisms of J. M. Robertson³² or the elaborate excursus by W. B. Smith,³³ most of which are rather beside the mark, we feel that Schmiedel, though not intending it has done much to undermine

MODERN CRITICISM

the validity of the Gospel tradition, and this flows from his presupposition. In § 131 he says,³⁴ "when a profane historian finds before him a historical document which testifies to the worship of a hero unknown to other sources, he attaches first and foremost importance to those features which cannot be deduced merely from the fact of this worship, and he does so on the simple and sufficient ground that they would not be found in this source unless the author had met with them as fixed data of tradition. The same fundamental principle may safely be applied in the case of the gospels." It is here that we join issue with Schmiedel and with a multitude of critics who follow him. That principle is of real value in proving against Drews, Kalthoff, Smith, Jensen, etc., that the man Jesus did actually exist; but when it is applied as it constantly is to discredit statements of the New Testament writers in regard to various aspects of the person of Jesus; to infer that when they being worshippers of Jesus speak in terms of reverence and even adoration of him they loved, their statements are therefore unworthy of credit, we enter an emphatic protest. Granting that worshippers of other persons spoke or wrote in terms of reverence or adoration of those they worshipped, and that they did so either falsely or in error, we are not going to say that their conduct provides a universal canon of criticism, and that Jesus was no more than an ordinary

JESUS AND PAUL

man or even an exceptional man because other men have been erroneously or fraudulently described as gods by their adherents. If the records of the life and influence of Jesus, not merely through the few years of His life on earth but in all the ages since, will be satisfied by an explanation which regards him as a man and nothing more, be it so ; but if they will not, we are not to cast out of the record as unhistorical anything that speaks of Him in terms that would not fit an ordinary or even an exceptional man, merely because of a presupposition that for him to be anything more is antecedently impossible.

Criticism and Inspiration.—One other preliminary point that needs consideration is the relation between Criticism and Inspiration. We have the books of the New Testament in manuscripts older than most, if not all, of the classical works accepted as genuine to-day ; we have extensive tradition through the works of historians and other writers carrying their origin back to a period not very far distant from the times at which the events they profess to record are said to have happened ; consequently, unless we are to give up all history and say we know nothing of the past, we are bound to accept them as *prima facie* evidence of reality and say that until they are proved unworthy of confidence we are justified in appealing to them as sources of knowledge. As to their value as

MODERN CRITICISM

sources, that we readily admit (with one reservation) has to be judged in the same way and by the same tests as other works claiming a similar antiquity.

That is the function of criticism ; first of the lower criticism, consideration of the actual manuscripts and versions to enable us to decide what we can say they actually contain, and what are their respective probable dates, and from that point of view their relative values. Then the higher criticism, consideration of the contents to decide from internal indications whether there are in them strata of varied age and differing authorship. It is in this sphere of the higher criticism that the difficulties which have caused so much stir in the last hundred years have arisen. Textual criticism while needing a very extensive and specialised apparatus of scholarship open to comparatively few, covers a field whose limits can be recognised by any one who has the requisite capacity and will take the trouble needed to find them, and we may say that those limits have been practically reached. Of course other manuscripts may be discovered, and these might possibly have some revelations to make on points of detail, but not on essential points, from the sources we already have ; the problems of the higher criticism would remain practically what they are now. But in using the methods of higher criticism one reservation has to be borne in mind, and that is the fact of

JESUS AND PAUL

inspiration. The Bible is not as has so often been said, exactly on the same level as other books ; its inspiration enables it to claim credence for views of life which might not be accepted in other environments. It makes known facts which do not come within the limits of everyday experience, but which are nevertheless facts of experience, verifiable and often verified by the witness of the Spirit in the heart of the reader. This is a point of great importance in considering the function of criticism. Those who believe in the divine inspiration of the Bible are often sorely puzzled by the suggestion that portions at any rate of its contents were not written by the authors to whom they have been traditionally ascribed, with the implication that such portions can have no claim to divine inspiration, but this is a misapprehension. The theory that underlies that difficulty is the old theory of verbal inspiration revived recently in its most uncompromising form, so uncompromisingly indeed, that it shows its practical worthlessness. For if (as Dr. Bishop emphasises³⁵) the inspiration applies only to the original parchments (supposing it was originally written on parchment), we can only admit with regret that those parchments have long since vanished, and that while we will do our best to come as near as we can through the help of the existing documents to what those originals contained, we cannot give absolute guarantee that what we have is in every

MODERN CRITICISM

minute particular identical with those originals. We may suppose that the originals, if we had them, would (subject always to the principle of development) give us Divine thought, but inasmuch as we have not got them and cannot get them, it is wiser to take the position now accepted with practical unanimity by those who believe in inspiration; that the Scriptures as we now have them, contain the word of God, and that we shall find the best evidence and criterion of inspiration in their inspiring power, not in any traditions as to authorship. Inspiration is a matter for spiritual perception, and would remain the same, whoever the human author might be. The influence of the Bible on the side of the upward development of humanity, in spite of much misuse and misunderstanding has been so powerful for good that it is difficult to conceive what the world would have been without it; although we grant, as former ages were loth to do, the good that has been wrought by other religions and uplifting agencies. Where a so-called Christian nation develops barbarian tendencies, such as have been so painfully manifest in recent days; it is unfortunately only too easy to show by the contrast between their actions, and both the spirit and letter of the Bible, that whatever professions of attachment to Christianity or of reverence for the Bible may be made by them, they are actually destitute of and probably know

JESUS AND PAUL

nothing of the spirit of Christ. But these pitiful failures do not prove as some might suggest that Christianity or its sacred books are powerless for good ; the study of comparative religion shows incontestably the superiority, when it is loyally accepted, of the Christian message and its influence for good, and the only explanation of that superiority that we can accept as adequate is the larger inpouring of the divine. To use its own phrase "holy men of old spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit ;"³⁶ uprushes,³⁷ or as Gardner describes³⁸ them, inrushes of the superconscious from beyond the threshold.

It is as a repository of such inspired and in their turn inspiring experiences that the Bible has had such a helpful and healthful influence on the life of humanity, and that feature has always to be borne in mind when we come to deal with it according to the methods of the higher criticism. Those who have experienced in their own lives and seen in the lives of others the workings of Divine power expect to find records of such working also in the lives of men and women in the past. They naturally look for traces of the Divine power, of inspiration enabling men and women to be and do what without it they could not ; and the presence in the records of such experiences, so far from suggesting to them fraud or dishonesty are rather indications of genuineness, and what they will most urgently seek is a

MODERN CRITICISM

criterion to distinguish that which can rightly be traced to Divine influence from things that are the result of pretence or falsehood or imitation. There will always be counterfeits where there is true coin ; the false would have no value if the true did not exist ; there will always be those who falsely and hypocritically claim inspiration because they know the power that true inspiration has exercised and can exercise ; but the existence of the false does not prove the non-existence or destroy the value of the true ; it rather warns us to be on our guard that we do not, when rooting up the tares, root up the wheat also. Higher Criticism which is to be worthy of the name must admit and ever bear in mind the reality of the divine inspiration in the books with which it deals and realise that it is with the traditions relating to their origin, their authorship, their date and kindred matters, and not with their inspiration that it has a legitimate and useful work to do.³⁹

Tradition.—Even in regard to its work in dealing with tradition it seems necessary to enter a *caveat*. The estimates of the value of tradition are very various, ranging from an almost blind confidence to utter scorn and contempt ; the tendency of the more radical criticism being in the direction of under-estimation, so that Sanday ⁴⁰ is probably justified in asking “ why is tradition and everything that can be called traditional looked on so much

JESUS AND PAUL

askance? It is really a reaction from one extreme to another. Those who hold the 'reduced' form of Christianity practically isolate themselves here in the twentieth century and ask, what verifiable facts can we lay down? what demonstrable propositions can we commit ourselves to as modern men? Others do not feel that they can isolate themselves in this way from their predecessors or from the corporate teaching of the body to which they belong. They are conscious of an organic connexion or solidarity with the Church of the past, and they desire to maintain this connexion. They are not individualists and they do not wish to be. They have a respect for science, and they are prepared to put their opinions to the test of science, but in certain cases where the continuity of the old and the new is involved, they are content with lower degrees of proof if higher is not to be had."

We are prepared to investigate the claims of traditional belief in the light of reasonable historical method, only claiming that the very antiquity of a belief entitles it to at least a respectful hearing before it is dismissed. Such considerations enable us to believe that even if the old traditions as to authorship of some of the books of the New Testament cannot now be accepted, they point to a connexion between the documents we now have and earlier documents not now extant which will enable us to accept the existing documents as embodying authorities

MODERN CRITICISM

for both the life and words of the Christ which go back nearly, if not quite, to his own time; while as far as Paul is concerned, the traditional views are now again almost universally accepted as valid.

CHAPTER II

SOURCES

COMING now to these sources we may say that as any knowledge we have of Paul is included in the sources from which we learn about Jesus we shall be able practically to deal with them together. There is indeed one source for Jesus, (the spiritual experience of His disciples in the ages since His earthly life), which is not available for Paul, but as far as we depend upon the testimony of contemporaries of their earthly life, all we know of Paul is contained in works which deal also with Jesus.

These are generally divided into canonical and extra-canonical,⁴¹ and as the latter are both in quantity and quality gravely inferior to the former it will be most convenient to deal with them first. They may be divided into profane and Christian ; the former comprising any references in secular historians, the latter, statements in the works known as New Testament Apocryphal writings. As far as secular history is concerned it is necessary to state quite frankly that the references are exceedingly few, and with one exception, of small value. They comprise statements by Tacitus, Suetonius, Pliny

SOURCES

and Josephus, with certain references in the Talmud. Tacitus and Suetonius are the only two contemporary historians of Rome whose works have come down to us⁴². Tacitus was dealing with the whole of the affairs of the vast Roman Empire; Suetonius with the life of an Emperor; we could not therefore expect more than a bare reference to events or persons who, viewed from the standpoint of an Empire or an Emperor, would seem utterly insignificant; yet one of these references is of great importance.

There has arisen in recent years a very energetic movement in favour of the position that Jesus never existed as a real man on the earth, and as the persons chiefly responsible for this agitation have some popular gifts, and have made their appeal chiefly to the popular imagination, an impression has been made on some minds that the advocates of the theory had a strong case and might be found to be justified in their contention. This impression was perhaps stronger than it might otherwise have been from the fact that the attack on the historicity of Jesus seemed to take visible shape almost simultaneously at several different points. Drews, Jensen and Kalthoff in Germany, J. M. Robertson in England and W. B. Smith in America all published works within a few years of each other asserting that Jesus had never lived, that the supposed evidence for his existence was unreliable, and that the existence of Christianity

JESUS AND PAUL

could be accounted for on hypotheses which did not admit that such a person had ever lived. To ordinary Christians the assertion will seem so outrageously absurd that they will probably regard the spending of any time on its refutation as absolute waste, but in view of the fact that in Germany the matter created an intense popular commotion, and that in England even to-day men of high spiritual and mental calibre are to be found acting as its advocates, it cannot be allowed to pass unchallenged, as it is quite capable in such an eventuality of claiming judgment in its favour in default of refutation.

Tacitus.—We lay considerable stress then upon the testimony of Tacitus⁴³ as evidence for the historicity of Jesus. Of course its validity as well as its value has been questioned. W. B. Smith in *Ecce Deus*⁴⁴ heads a long passage with the title "the silence of Tacitus," and Drews⁴⁵ says "we are strongly disposed to suspect that the passage was transferred from Sulpicius to the text of Tacitus by the hand of a monastic copyist or forger, for the greater glory of God, and in order to strengthen the truth of the Christian tradition by a pagan witness." But this is the merest suspicion with not a tittle of evidence to support it; for the works of Hochart on which Drews tacitly bases himself are rendered absolutely valueless by his wild suggestion⁴⁶ that the whole work of Tacitus is a late forgery. The whole of the criticism of the genuineness of

SOURCES

Tacitus' testimony is just suspicion, unsupported by any evidence, and definitely refuted both by the weight of tradition and the opinion of scholars of reputation ; but the suspicions are brought out again and again as if they had never been dealt with, on the principle that if only you throw mud often enough some of it is bound to stick. The statement of Dr. F. C. Conybeare,⁴⁷ a strong radical critic, is however sufficiently clear in showing the weakness of this criticism, " the narrative of Tacitus is frank, straightforward, and in keeping with all we know or can infer in regard to Christianity in that epoch ; " and we accept the passage in Tacitus as practically irrefutable evidence of the historical existence of Jesus in accordance with the general Christian tradition.

Suetonius⁴⁸ speaks of " Judaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes," but the possible variety of interpretation makes the reference though not negligible of small value, while Pliny's statement in his letter to Trajan (circa 110 A.D.) that the Christians were accustomed to sing a hymn to Christ as a God, is too late to be of real worth.

We turn next to Josephus, in whose work on "*the Antiquities of the Jews*"⁴⁹ occurs a reference to Jesus which, if genuine, would be of tremendous value as evidence for His earthly existence. Schürer who goes into the question very fully,⁵⁰ after discussing whether there are interpolations in the passage or whether it is wholly spurious

JESUS AND PAUL

sums up as follows: ⁵¹ "we therefore, although absolute certainty on such questions cannot be attained, are inclined to prefer the theory of the utter spuriousness as simpler than that of the merely partial spuriousness of the passage;" and the majority of scholars would probably agree with him, although there has been a reaction in its favour in recent years. J. Weiss,⁵² e.g., in 1910, said, "I cannot say that there appears to me absolute and clear necessity for rejecting the whole passage;" and Professor Burkitt,⁵³ "I believe the famous passage about our Lord to be his, *i.e.*, Josephus'." There is another incidental reference⁵⁴ which is regarded with somewhat less suspicion, but Schürer⁵⁵ thinks there is considerable ground also here for suspicion of Christian interpolation, and J. Weiss⁵⁶ while wavering on that point declines to use the passage as evidence; and in this they are followed by most scholars. There is therefore, in our judgment fair ground for W. B. Smith to head his treatment of the testimony of Josephus with the words "the silence of Josephus." We admit the silence of Josephus, but we do not view it in the same light or accept the explanation which Smith and those who think with him offer in regard to it. Their explanation is that Josephus said nothing because he knew nothing, because there was nothing for him to know since Jesus never existed. But there is another, and to our mind, in spite of Drews,⁵⁷ a much more

SOURCES

reasonable explanation, and that is the bias of Josephus himself. Josephus was a Jew who clung to the traditions of the fathers and would therefore be loth to mention anything about a movement that was threatening to destroy what he most cherished. He was also a Jew who was in high favour with the Roman ruling powers, and would naturally keep out of his record reference to incidents which would be distasteful to those who desired to regard Rome as the beneficent patron of a people who were becoming docile and obedient to Roman rule. Jesus was a *bete noire* to both Jews and Romans, and the courtly historian preferred to leave him unmentioned.⁵⁸

As far as the Talmud is concerned, the researches of Dalman, Herford and others⁵⁹ show that although the works are of too late a date to give anything like contemporary testimony, the references, breathing as they do bitter hatred, are evidence of the authors' belief in the real existence of the man they decry.⁶⁰

As far as the non-Canonical Christian remains are concerned, we do not need to go to them for information in detail. Where they differ from the works included in the Canon they are probably generally in error, if not false;⁶¹ but as far as the fact of the historic existence of Jesus is concerned, their evidence is strong and clear. Stories of the quantity and quality of their calibre are not entirely imaginary; they were

JESUS AND PAUL

written because the one of whom they professed to treat had occupied a large share in the public interest of his time, and so far they are valid evidence of his real historicity.⁶² The same line of argument will apply in the case of what are now known as "Agrapha,"⁶³ sayings ascribed to Jesus which are not found in our Canonical Gospels; some of them in the Apocryphal gospels; others like the Oxyrhynchus Logia without tradition as to their authorship. Their intrinsic value may not generally be great, but they offer strong *prima facie* evidence of the real existence of Jesus.

Canonical.—Our chief authorities for the life of Jesus are, of course, the works included in the Canon of the New Testament. The value of that evidence it is difficult to regard too highly, for though we have estimates innumerable, ranging from the strongest approbation to the most dogmatic denunciation, an impartial review will justify us in saying that the vast majority of scholars are agreed not only that the evidence these documents afford for the actual historical existence of Jesus is so overwhelming as to be conclusive, but also that the information they give is sufficient for us to gain from them knowledge about Jesus such as is almost unparalleled in the case of any other character of antiquity.⁶⁴ Of course we shall hear the objection that this testimony comes from believers in Jesus, with the assumption implied if not expressed that its

SOURCES

value is thereby seriously discounted, if not entirely destroyed; but the objection is really worthless. J. Weiss⁶⁵ has dealt with this matter extremely well: "What rule of method of historical investigation says to us that we are under all circumstances to mistrust interested parties? There are indeed people in all times to whom the utterances of a pious man are *a priori* suspicious. With them we do not contend; they are born 150 years too late. The truly unprejudiced man will say, we shall always arrive better at the true essence of a personality through men who have surrendered themselves to his influence, than through those whom hate has made blind, or those who have taken practically no interest in him." The testimonies of the New Testament may be interpreted in various ways, but we shall not necessarily declare them suspicious as historical sources because the men who composed or compiled them were believers in Jesus as one who had done them infinite good; rather shall we come to them with the presumption that their relations with him would tend to make them reliable witnesses.

We do not propose to touch on the contributions of any New Testament authors outside the four Gospels, the history called the Acts of the Apostles, and the works attributed to Paul. Had we not these richer fountains, we should be able indeed to sift out from the other works much that would not only prove the historicity

JESUS AND PAUL

of Jesus, but also enable us to gather a not inadequate idea of what He was and did ; but the richness of the material in those we have mentioned is sufficient apology for passing the others by.

The earliest documents in the New Testament which we have nearly as they were written are probably the letters of Paul, and we need not be surprised that there has been immense controversy over their validity and value as authentic sources of historical information. Until the publication by Baur of his great work on Paul the traditional view that the letters ascribed in the Canon to Paul were really his work had indeed scarcely been called in question ; Schweitzer comprises the whole history of such attempts in ten pages of his work, *Paul and his Interpreters*. Baur put forward the view, based however on dogmatic considerations, that only the four Haupt-briefe, can be confidently used as sources ; and the controversy he then started has been carried on ever since at tremendous length and in minute detail ; but necessarily in a subject so definitely limited, there must in such extensive treatment be a very large amount of repetition, and it suffices for practical purposes to deal with schools and representative men. The controversy has naturally taken two opposite directions, toward conservatism and toward radicalism. On the radical side the climax has been reached in the writings of the Dutch school⁶⁶ and those

SOURCES

associated with them,⁶⁷ who, rejecting all the valuable evidence of the Apostolic Fathers,⁶⁸ not only deny that any of these letters were written by Paul, but also that there was any real Apostle Paul at the time in which tradition places him, to write these letters.

The criticism of the school by Dr. S. Davidson who described its work as a wave of hyper-criticism (for which he was severely taken to task by van Manen⁶⁹) has been endorsed almost unanimously by subsequent investigators ;⁷⁰ and the theories may now be regarded as practically defunct, notwithstanding a careful reservation by Harnack,⁷¹ a somewhat hesitating approval by Drews,⁷² and hearty endorsement by von Eysinga and Whittaker.

If we except this school, we can say without hesitation that the tendency of criticism since Baur has been of a decidedly conservative nature.⁷³ Wrede,⁷⁴ B. Weiss,⁷⁵ Beyschlag,⁷⁶ Bacon,⁷⁷ Moffatt,⁷⁸ Jülicher,⁷⁹ and Vischer,⁸⁰ though with various exceptions, accept most save the Pastorals ; while Deissmann,⁸¹ McGiffert,⁸² Sabatier⁸³ and Ropes,⁸⁴ have no doubt about any except the Pastorals, and regard even them, if not actually written by Paul as essentially Pauline ; and most English scholars⁸⁵ accept all, including the Pastorals, as Paul's own work. Our own view is that in spite of very strong opposition to the Pauline authorship of Ephesians, all the letters ascribed to Paul may be accepted as his with the

JESUS AND PAUL

possible exception of the Pastorals, and that as far as they are concerned we think that the weight of authority is in favour of their authenticity as well. The letter to the Hebrews though showing traces of Pauline influence was certainly not written by Paul and does not therefore come within the scope of our undertaking.

A further preliminary question which is of some importance is that of the order in which the letters were written. It is now generally admitted that the Canonical order is not to be accepted, but there is not by any means such unanimity as to what order should take its place. For a long time the letters to the Thessalonians were regarded as the earliest, but this has been challenged in recent years, and a claim has been preferred on behalf of Galatians. The decision on this point is involved in the further question⁸⁶ of the locality of the Churches to which the letter was written, and on this point we have no hesitation in expressing our opinion in favour of what is known as the South Galatian theory; and this leads us to agree with Mr. Rendall⁸⁷ and many others,⁸⁸ that this letter to the Galatians is the earliest letter of Paul now extant, written before, if only a little before, those to the Thessalonians, which we put next in order; and that these were followed by those to the Corinthians, after which he wrote the letter to the Romans.

The most important question in regard to the

SOURCES

letters of the Captivity is the position of the letter to the Philippians, for this contains some of the most impressive Christological teaching of the Apostle. Lightfoot⁸⁹ argues strongly for placing it first, but the general opinion⁹⁰ with which we agree, puts it last of these letters and written from Rome (not Cæsarea⁹¹). Bacon⁹² suggests that it was written later than the close of the narrative in the Acts, and there is nothing improbable in this view, but the point need not be pressed. These questions of relative date must be determined mainly by references and hints as to the events in the Apostle's life, as only if we limit ourselves to these, can we use our conclusions to enable us to form opinions on the question of development in his thought; and as all the letters of the captivity must be placed within a space of about two years and that toward the close of his career when his views may be regarded as practically fixed, a few months either way would not have much influence on this point.

As to the Pastorals, although attempts⁹³ have been made to find a place for them within the period covered by the Acts of the Apostles, these attempts cannot in our judgment be regarded as successful, and we are only able to accept these letters as Paul's, on the assumption⁹⁴ that his career lasted some time after the point at which the narrative of Luke ends, and that the Pastorals find their origin within that period.

JESUS AND PAUL

The Acts of the Apostles, which though not (with the possible exception of the first chapter) a direct authority for the life of Jesus ; is of immense importance both for the life of Paul and for the views of the primitive Church about both Jesus and Paul.

It also has had a chequered experience in the hands of the critics, but like Paul's letters, is now being regarded with greater confidence than formerly.⁹⁵ The chief points of discussion have been the authorship, the date, and its value as an authority when compared with the Pauline Epistles. The traditional ascription of authorship to Luke, assuming him to have been the author of the third gospel, has been gravely questioned on the ground that the travel-narrative, generally known as the We-sections, which is almost universally accepted as coming from Luke, implies a different authorship for the rest of the work ; but in spite of the arguments of those⁹⁶ who plead for different authors, we feel compelled to agree with Harnack,⁹⁷ who has treated this subject in a most exhaustive fashion, in assuming the same author for practically the whole book, and to accept Luke as that author. This conclusion carries with it the implication of early date, and also helps towards a right estimate of its value in regard to the letters of Paul, enabling us to view them as practically co-ordinate authorities, whose differences where they exist, would be easily explainable were we able to see

SOURCES

matters exactly as they appeared to them from their respective standpoints.

We turn finally to the Gospels, the main sources of our knowledge of Jesus. Do they give us contemporary records, and if not how near do they come to the facts? The literature which has gathered round the Synoptic problem is far too large to be dealt with here; but all investigators are agreed that at the back of all the documents there lies a period of oral tradition, though it need not have been long. The habits of the time, as well as the standing of the first adherents of Jesus precluded of course anything like the work of modern biographers, but there were probably collections of His sayings compiled by loving admirers even in His lifetime, while the statement at the commencement of the Gospel according to Luke shows the existence of early attempts at framing a narrative of some of the events in His life.

How far is it likely that anything has survived from this earliest period? It is now pretty generally agreed that probably the earliest element in our existing documents is extracts from a collection (technically described as *Q.*, or the Source)⁹⁸ of sayings of the Master with a very few incidents from His life which survives in very similar form in our present Gospels of Matthew and Luke, and which Harnack⁹⁹ thinks might be quite feasibly assigned to the year 50 A.D., or even earlier, and if that be correct we

JESUS AND PAUL

should get very near to the mind and heart of Jesus.¹⁰⁰ That is a point on which it is desirable to lay stress because subsequent documents have been held to show traces of the influence of the composer, and the question has naturally arisen and been widely discussed in regard to each how far we have in them "tendency" writings ; compositions framed not so much to give an accurate account of the life and words of the Master as to support a special view of His person and career, an interpretation rather than a transcript. This is perhaps the gravest problem with which we have to deal, for critics of all shades of opinion have proceeded to analyse the documents for traces of tendency with such good will that we may certainly say that they have made the tradition of none effect through their endeavours, and the reproaches of Drews, Smith and other radicals, that the liberal critics have not left us even the shadow of a shade of a historical Jesus do not appear so extravagant as might be imagined. In regard, *e.g.*, to the Gospel of Mark which is now generally regarded as the earliest of the Gospels in the form in which we now have them, we are met by the assertion¹⁰¹ that "his writing everywhere presupposes the Church and its tradition ; that the facts here related come to us on the authority of no single writer, but as the expression of the common belief of the Christian society, with the corollary, that this relation of the Gospel to the Church,

SOURCES

while it is a guarantee of the general truthfulness of the facts recorded, is from another point of view a reminder that those facts must almost inevitably have been coloured by the Church's belief, although in this Gospel such modification has probably been small." An interesting variation of this view is that of Wellhausen,¹⁰² "that the narrative in St. Mark did not for the most part proceed from the intimate friends of Jesus. It has for the most part a somewhat rude popular character, such as it would have gathered during a considerable period of circulation by word of mouth among the common people ;" but against this we must set the dictum of J. Weiss,¹⁰³ "we must specially praise Mark as an artist." There is probably something in the theory¹⁰⁴ so earnestly championed by Weiss and others, that at the back of our present Gospel lies an even older document ; but whether that be so or not, there is practical agreement that the Papian tradition, that Mark presents us with Petrine reminiscences¹⁰⁵ is not far from the truth, even if there be a colouring of Paulinism,¹⁰⁶ which in view of the traditional account of the association between Paul and Mark cannot be regarded as unlikely. Further we need only to remember that the "Church" in those early days was still in such an inchoate condition as to mean little more than the small companies of disciples in various places with not as yet any strong corporate life, and that consequently the opinion

JESUS AND PAUL

of the Church was as yet practically identical with the views of the few who had companied with Jesus and those who had been gathered in by them, to realise that the "tendency" in Mark is so slight as to detract little if at all from its value as an early record. We can therefore sum up our own view in the words of Professor Menzies¹⁰⁷ "Mark wrote his gospel, not with a view to Church use, but for the information of the brethren on a subject which was very important for them and had not yet been put in a connected form. He had reminiscences which he desired to put in writing before they were lost to the world, and he worked these up into a complete statement along with the better known traditions, so that the Christians might no longer be at a loss when asked to give an account of the Founder of their faith." The amount of discount that will have to be taken off on account of "tendency" when we use Mark as an authority for our knowledge of Jesus is certainly not large.¹⁰⁸ As to date it has been generally assigned to the period between 60 and 70 A.D., but we see no reason why it might not be earlier.

As to Luke, Harnack argues forcibly for placing its composition before 70 and nearer 60 A.D.,¹⁰⁹ a view quite consistent with Salmon's suggestion that the chief source of Luke's knowledge was probably the public recital of the Gospel history in the Church at Antioch. There are however strong advocates¹¹⁰ for a later date, the chief

SOURCES

reason being the supposition that the author was acquainted with the work of Josephus, but this cannot be regarded as proved, and is rather, we venture to think, exceedingly unlikely.¹¹¹

There has been much discussion as to the trustworthiness of Luke as a historian and here we also incline to think that the weight of opinion is in favour of the tradition which puts his value high,¹¹² although we readily admit that "we cannot regard him as very satisfactory from the modern historical point of view."¹¹³ That there are traces of Pauline influence is only to be expected, and will in no way lessen the value of his testimony; but Schmiedel is probably right in looking upon it as comparatively small. Finally we readily admit, though not perhaps so extensively as he would, what Carpenter¹¹⁴ describes as Luke's "new presentment of Christ and Christianity," by which we understand that the author like most authors, has allowed his own views and feelings to have some influence both upon his choice and his presentation of his material, without at all implying thereby that his representation is either inaccurate or misleading.

The last of the Synoptics in point of date, if our view of the early date for Luke be accepted, is of course, Matthew, but the difference in time between them need not have been great, and it is quite possible that he also has preserved for us some earlier traditions not found elsewhere,

JESUS AND PAUL

especially in some of the discourses.¹¹⁵ There seems, however, to be ground for the suggestion that the Gospel as we have it, has received some touching up in ecclesiastical interests¹¹⁶ at a later date and the Trinitarian formula of xxviii. 19 has been severely attacked as a late importation.¹¹⁷ Many critics are disposed to see in Matthew, as in Luke, some legendary elements,¹¹⁸ but these if admitted are not extensive, and on the whole we agree in regard to Matthew's special contribution with Dr. Allen¹¹⁹ in taking a very favourable view of the writer of this Gospel as "an editor who in broad outline faithfully reproduced his sources; that the incidents recorded in these narratives must have been a commonplace of the Church tradition which he represents; and that that tradition, with all due allowance for some amount of working up in literary form and setting, must be regarded as having preserved a substantial kernel of actual concrete and historical fact."

We come finally to the Gospel according to John, and the problem here is very different from that which faced us in the Synoptics. Most of the critics who really count agree that the latest of the Synoptics can be dated within at any rate fifty years of the death of Jesus; that the authors if not those to whom tradition assigned them were in touch with men who were His contemporaries and had access to and made use of records which go back very near to His own day; and

SOURCES

that the composers if they did write from a standpoint of their own have not allowed that idiosyncrasy to overpower and hide the essential facts which make us know we are dealing with actual history. With the Gospel of John it is often said all this is different. Here, it is suggested, we are dealing with romance, very beautiful, but not true; the Jesus who meets us here is not the Jesus who trod the hills and dales of Galilee; the events here recorded as far as they differ from the Synoptic account did not take place, and the words ascribed to Jesus are merely the charming day dreams of a loving but not over scrupulous admirer who never saw Jesus nor heard Him speak. On the question of date there has been indeed a remarkable reaction. Baur suggested 170 A.D., but the result of examination has been to push this further and further back until now, with scarcely any exception,¹²⁰ it is agreed that the Gospel was in existence at the beginning of the second or even late in the first century; and as tradition has never suggested anything earlier, we may rest content with that. On the question of authorship there is still remarkable divergence of opinion. A very large number,¹²¹ considerably more than might be imagined from the confident way in which those opposed to them speak, hold to the tradition that the author was the Apostle John, the Gospel being a work of his old age. Many others hold that John founded a school, and

JESUS AND PAUL

that the Gospel as we have it is the work of a member or members of that school, embodying probably some traditions preserved by the Apostle himself,¹²² Wendt, *e.g.*, contending for a substantial Johannine element which he has worked out in great detail.¹²³ Wernle¹²⁴ in his absolutely destructive criticism stands almost alone. In view of this remarkable diversity and uncertainty we cordially endorse the statement of Mr. Wild¹²⁵ "the important fact to keep before us is that even on the failure to establish its Johannine authorship, the book does not cease to be historical ;" and though our own judgment leans strongly to the Apostolic authorship, we find ourselves in considerable sympathy with the beautiful summing up of Dr. E. F. Scott,¹²⁶ "The Gospel is the transcript of the personal experience of one who spiritually though not literally had communed with Christ ; and the appeal it has made to the deepest instincts of mankind may be largely explained from the fact that it is not the work of a literal eye-witness. It describes the Saviour not as He was within the narrow limits of His life on earth, but as He is for ever to those who have known and loved Him. When He seemed to have departed, when the hope that He would come back again had almost disappeared, John found the way back into His presence. He discovered that the Lord was still near, that after the little time of parting He had returned never more to leave His people, and

SOURCES

He has taught how those who have not seen and yet have believed may draw near to Christ and abiding in Him have life through His name."

This is what we meant when we said¹²⁷ that one source of knowledge of Jesus is the spiritual experience of His disciples since His earthly life, which we with many others regard as a further rich source of knowledge of Jesus, the same who walked the fields of Galilee. To those who know nothing of this experience it may be impossible even to explain it; those who have experienced can only say "we speak that we do know, and it is the most helpful thing in life;" it may be mysticism, but it is a mysticism within the reach of all, not a secret knowledge for a select few; all that is needed is the heart of the "little child"; readiness to receive.

Other Theories.—But we cannot dwell longer on the sources; in passing from them we must look briefly at the alternative theories of the origin of the Gospels suggested by those who do not believe in the historic Jesus. The most elaborate is that of Drews, based on J. M. Robertson and W. B. Smith, the last of whom suggests that "there was a pre-Christian Jesus-cult of a more or less mysterious character which was widely spread in and about Palestine, and whose time-limits may be taken as from about 100 B.C. to 100 A.D. That Christianity arose from the coalescence of several nearly allied cults and not one source. That the word Nazarene is not derived from

JESUS AND PAUL

the name of a town called Nazareth which probably did not then exist, but from a word-stem common in Hebrew and Aramaic meaning guardian or protector. That this term Nazarene was the name of a Jewish sect before the date assigned to Jesus, and that both Jesus and Paul either were or were asserted to be members of this sect. That the Greek Nazoraios, or Nazaraïos, represents the Aramaic Naṣaria, and probably combines the two words Nasar and Jah, and means Guardian Jahweh—which again is represented by the phrase "Jesus the Nazarene."

Mr. Wooding¹²⁸ from whom I have taken this summary adds, "these propositions are supported by a most minute examination of the New Testament text, and of the authorities concerned with this subject both ancient and modern;" but it is necessary to say that this statement is singularly inaccurate, and Mr. Wooding would do well to consult the work of Dr. Conybeare referred to above. Professor Smith brings forward a great many ingenious speculations, both his own and of other learned men, but the authorities are sadly to seek. The whole great theory is pure imagination. There is literally no evidence whatever of the existence of any such pre-Christian Jesus-cult; there is no evidence whatever that Christianity arose from the coalescence of several allied cults. The non-existence of the town of Nazareth is merely a hypothesis supported indeed by Cheyne, who, however, with

SOURCES

great caution simply says,¹²⁹ " we cannot venture to assert positively that there was a city called Nazareth in Jesus' time," and suggests that Nazareth is equivalent to Galilee, a suggestion which as it does not suit his purpose, is quietly passed over by the American Professor. The proposed derivations are mere hypotheses not accepted by most competent scholars, and finally there is no record of a pre-Christian sect of Nazarenes. Still less is it necessary to dwell on the extraordinary hypothesis of Jensen,¹³⁰ that the Christian documents are merely variants of the Babylonian Gilgamesh epic. The parallels he suggests are so amazingly unconvincing that they only need to be read to have the theory disbelieved, and it is rejected even by Smith.¹³¹ There remains the theory of Kalthoff¹³² that Christianity should be regarded as a particular development of social life and not as the work of a personal founder of a religion ; indeed, as the result of a great social movement in the first century among the lower classes of the Roman Empire ; but it is not necessary to go into it further as he himself gave up some portions of his theory, and it is now generally discarded even by other radical thinkers¹³³ ; while it rests mainly on positions which have not won general acceptance, viz., that history is best explained by denying the influence of great personalities, and that personal religion would have seemed folly to the early Christians.¹³⁴ To conclude

JESUS AND PAUL

then, these prolegomena, we need have no hesitation in asserting in the light of the failure of this and the other theories which are supposed to have completely banished the figure of the historic Jesus,¹³⁵ that His reality shines out more convincingly than ever, and that it is the traditional and not these modern views which most satisfactorily explain the facts, and enable us to understand the rise of Christianity.

CHAPTER III

PAUL AND HIS ENVIRONMENT

TO understand the relation of Paul to Jesus, and his contribution to Christianity, we have to realise not only what manner of man he was, but how he came to be what he was and to do what he did. A man of really wide and varied culture, "he moulded," says Pfeiderer,¹³⁶ "his own most intimate beliefs, based on experience and feeling, in various media according to the needs and purposes of the moment ; now using the forensic categories of the Jewish scholastic theology, now the poetic imaginings of the apocalyptic writings, now the animistic forms of popular metaphysics, now the symbolism of the mysteries, now the phrases of the Hellenistic Jewish religious, or of the Stoic and cynic popular philosophy." There is a good deal that is true in this statement, but not by any means all that it suggests, and we have to be carefully on our guard lest in the acknowledgment of his debt to others we overlook the originality of the man and think of his work as a mere rechauffé of ideas borrowed from many sources, a danger which Pfeiderer has by no means avoided. This tendency to look upon

JESUS AND PAUL

Paul as a mere retailer of ideas he has picked up elsewhere, is specially evident in the treatment of his relations to the Rabbinical¹³⁷ learning of his day. Professor Bruce¹³⁸ criticises Pfeiderer severely but not unjustly on this point, and Kennedy¹³⁹ is undoubtedly right when he says, "it is a current fashion to minimise Paul's relation to the ancient scriptures of his people as compared with his indebtedness to the teaching of post-canonical literature in its various branches, but the spirit of his religion is essentially alien to contemporary Judaism and in profound harmony with the prophets and psalmists of the Old Testament." His use of the Old Testament is of course strongly affected by the allegorical method which he applies so largely and which he had probably acquired from this legal Rabbinical training ; although it has been suggested¹⁴⁰ that Paul's Rabbinism was a negligible quantity and that any one who speaks of him as Rabbinical does not understand what the Rabbinism of his day was. Schweitzer¹⁴¹ practically denies indebtedness for Paul either to the Old Testament (which is surely a curious inversion of the fact) or to the Rabbinism of his day, of which, however, he says we know practically nothing, but that it seems probable that the epistles of Paul and the Apocalypses of Ezra and Baruch are witnesses to a Rabbinism or a movement within its sphere, concerning which the Rabbinic tradition which later became fixed in written forms

PAUL'S ENVIRONMENT

gives us no information. That Schweitzer has done useful service in calling attention to these late-Jewish writings¹⁴² as he calls these Apocalypses, as sources whence Paul may have derived some of his ideas may be readily granted without at all committing us to approval of his extravagant theories of their commanding place in the formation of Christianity, and his reduction of it, whether according to Jesus or to Paul, to an elaborate form of eschatology. On the whole, however, we are inclined to agree with Stevens¹⁴³ that "the Old Testament was his chief text-book in the Jewish schools, and continued to be to him a great storehouse of facts and arguments for his work as a Christian teacher. As he was trained in the methods of interpretation current among the rabbis of his time, Rabbinic modes of exegesis had their influence upon his use of the Old Testament and have left clear traces in his epistles; but to the student who considers his training the matter of chief surprise is that he should have been so free from its extravagances and employed its methods with so much reserve."

Another factor which is said¹⁴⁴ to have had great weight in the formation of Paul's modes of thought and expression is Hellenism, but here again views differ widely. Harnack¹⁴⁵ rightly points out that we must distinguish between two different though somewhat similar things. On the one hand there was a Judaism (between the

JESUS AND PAUL

Graeco-Roman world in search of spiritual religion and the Jewish commonwealth which possessed it) a Judaism which penetrated by the Greek spirit was professedly devoting itself to the task of bringing a new religion to the Greek world ; the Jewish religion, but that religion in its kernel Greek, philosophically moulded, spiritualised, secularised. On the other hand there was Hellenism proper, the powerful but indeterminate influence which the Greek spirit exercised on all things Jewish and which has been one of the historical conditions determining the form of the Gospel. The Alexandrian and non-Palestinian Judaism, the union between Judaism and Hellenism, and the spiritualizing religion it produced, is still Judaism ; it formed the bridge by which chiefly the Gospel passed into the world, but it is not Hellenism. As to Hellenism proper, the influence of Greek culture, opinions differ widely. One says¹⁴⁶ that "Paul was a highly cultured man who was perfectly at home in all the forms of cultivated Greek society ;" another¹⁴⁷ that "his acquaintance with Greek culture is practically negligible if not non-existent," pointing out that on the generations in which Greek dogma was taking shape Paul exercised no influence whatever, supporting his view by the interesting fact that Hatch in his great work on *the influence of Greek ideas and usages upon the Christian Church* does not find it necessary to deal with Paul at all ; and also

PAUL'S ENVIRONMENT

that Harnack's exposition of the history of dogma cannot accept the suggestion that Paul recast the Gospel in the moulds of Greek thought.

But it is said that Paul who was born, or at any rate brought up, at Tarsus, then one of the chief seats of the Stoic philosophy, must have been considerably influenced by Stoicism,¹⁴⁸ and most interesting parallels¹⁴⁹ are exhibited between his writings and those of the great Stoic Seneca. Especially is this said to be the case with the doctrine of God,¹⁵⁰ of the ideal wise man,¹⁵¹ and the dualism involved in the Pauline doctrine of the flesh and the spirit ;¹⁵² but the similarities are far more of form than of essence and we may on the whole conclude that while Stoic influence is unmistakable, it is no more than might fairly be expected in one who was in close touch with the learning of his day ; that the Apostle adopted ideas generally current in his period which we find also in Seneca and other writers, but that it would be unjust to postulate direct borrowing¹⁵³ or to regard any of Paul's characteristic ideas as due to Stoicism. Very closely akin is the question of Paul's indebtedness to Plato. Ackermann¹⁵⁴ gives sundry parallels between Pauline and Platonic expressions and adds some striking similarities in thought. The same path has been trodden by Dr. James Adam,¹⁵⁵ but the result of examination is merely coincidence, not indebtedness. Similarity of thought or even of expression does not necessarily imply plagiarism,

JESUS AND PAUL

and we can readily admit these interesting parallels without at all granting that Paul's characteristic thought owes anything substantial to Plato.

We turn now to the other form of Greek influence of which Jowett¹⁵⁶ says, "Alexandrianism gave the form and thought; Judaism the life and power." Two lines of influence have been suggested, the Wisdom literature and the works of Philo. There are very definite traces of his knowledge of the book of Wisdom;¹⁵⁷ but here again all that can be shown is acquaintance not dependence, and Schweitzer¹⁵⁸ goes so far as to say that "Paul's attitude toward Jewish Hellenism is one of indifference, and in his letters no specifically Jewish-Hellenistic conceptions are to be found."

As to Philo, even Pfeiderer¹⁵⁹ who places so much stress on the Hellenism of Paul, thinks he can scarcely have known Philo's works, and no one would probably now agree with Jowett,¹⁶⁰ "either Philo is a Christian, or St. Paul learned Christianity from Philo;" even if they did not go as far as Schweitzer,¹⁶¹ "the resemblance is so general and colourless that it cannot be considered as proving anything;" probably J. Weiss reaches the heart of the matter when he says,¹⁶² "There is no evidence of literary dependence, *i.e.*, borrowing from any work of Philo's; a comparison of their conceptions is however instructive."

PAUL'S ENVIRONMENT

One other point of contact between Paul and the life of his time in regard to which research has been busy in recent years is the so-called mystery-religions. Sadler¹⁶³ says, "As Paul was steeped in the mystery-religions, he could only think out Christianity as a mystery-religion, and such indeed he made it;" Evelyn Underhill¹⁶⁴ more reasonably, "In the ancient mystery cults he saw the vital experiences of the soul in process of being saved, the rebirth, the heightened perception of reality, even the feeding on the Divine substance disclosed in the common things of sense. Hence with the instinct of the missionary for any image that might bring his meaning home to other minds he snatched at the language of the mysteries;" and Kennedy¹⁶⁵ "it was inevitable that he should become familiar at least from the outside, with religious ideas current in these influential cults, but it has also become clear that we dare not make far-reaching inferences from terminology as to the assimilation by Paul of Mystery-ideas, for the central conceptions of the mystery-religions belong to a different atmosphere from that in which the Apostle habitually moves." Even in regard to ritual, a matter on which many affirm a very definite indebtedness, Kennedy¹⁶⁶ says, "it is vain to endeavour to find points of contact here between Paul and the mystery-religions;" and Schweitzer,¹⁶⁷ "it seemed so easy at first to discover relationships between the sacramental

JESUS AND PAUL

views of Christianity and the mystery-religions ; to find common conceptions in view of the fact that in both cases cultus-meals and lustrations played a part and had a sacramental value ; but on closer examination, it appears that it is very difficult to get beyond the simple fact of resemblance of a very general character ; up to the present neither a direct nor an indirect connexion between the cultus-meal of Paul and those of the mystery-religions has been shown." These conclusions are of great importance in view of the endeavours that have been made to explain Christianity as a mere syncretism of elements derived from Judaism and the Graeco-Oriental religions. The whole imposing edifice of the Christ-myth worked out so elaborately by Drews and W. B. Smith collapses when it is shown that there is no such connexion as they postulate between primitive Christianity and the nature and mystery religions with which they make such play.

We have dealt now with the chief elements of culture which had a share in influencing the thought of Paul, and our conclusion is that they did not by any means take as large a part in this direction as is often ascribed to them. There are however other elements in his environment which have to be reckoned with in estimating the forces which made him what he was, chiefly his Jewish nationality, his Roman citizenship, and his relationship with Jesus and his followers.

PAUL'S ENVIRONMENT

It might be thought superfluous to argue the point that Paul was a Jew, but it is necessary to note (if only to get a true view of the critic and the value of his criticisms), that Drews¹⁶⁸ seems to have doubt on the matter; "in spite of the assurance that he was born a Jew, he seems to be Greek in everything." A more grotesque perversion of the facts could not be imagined; the whole trend of his thought and much of what is characteristic in his manner of expression, as well as the many definite statements on the point, are convincing evidence that we have to deal with one who in his early days was "a Hebrew of the Hebrews, a Pharisee of the Pharisees;" a man whose early associations centred round the synagogue and the Rabbinical school, whose earlier forms of thought and expression were chiefly moulded by his Jewish associations; a Jew, zealous, even fanatical for all associated with the name; and this although we grant with Deissmann¹⁶⁹ that he was essentially "a Septuagint Jew." As far as Roman citizenship is concerned little trace can be found beyond the possible influence of the great system of law and government in shaping some forensic conceptions, and the admiration for the powers that be as the protector of conscientious well-doers against fanatical persecutors; a very different attitude from that of later New Testament writers who were faced by persecution from this very ruling power.

JESUS AND PAUL

Much more important is the question of Paul's relations with Jesus and His followers ; did he know anything of them, and was he in any way influenced by them before he became a Christian, and what were his relations with them afterward ? As far as acquaintance before his conversion is concerned, that may be answered with a definite negative. In the classical passage¹⁷⁰ on this matter he says that years afterward he was still unknown by face to the churches of Judea. That shows that he had not in any way been in touch with the Apostles before his conversion, but it does not preclude the idea that he may have heard some of them when they were giving testimony to Jesus, and it is quite probable that he had come across some of them in their work of open-air preaching. Certainly he was present when Stephen preached the sermon which led to his death, and this is hardly likely to have been the only occasion on which he was able to gather a considerable amount of information with regard to the beliefs of the new sect. A man of such sterling honesty, even though possibly led away by passion, would not have taken the repeated violent steps he did against the Christians without having first made himself so far acquainted with their views as to feel that they were such as must at all costs be suppressed. Although he was unknown by sight to them, a good many of the Christians were probably well known to him, and he would already have a good

PAUL'S ENVIRONMENT

knowledge of the main elements of their teaching. And in this knowledge lay the material for much reflection. Not merely what the Christians said, but what they were, was illuminating; their conduct must have suggested to him questions as to the nature and source of the power that made them do what they did and become what they were. He knew a good deal about the Apostles and the Apostolic teaching before he became a Christian.

How about Jesus? Had he ever seen or heard Him in his pre-Christian days? It was certainly not impossible, for they must have been practically contemporaries. There are two statements which are thought to imply that he had: one in the first letter to the Corinthians,¹⁷¹ "Have not I seen Jesus Christ our Lord?" the other in the second letter¹⁷² to the same Church, "though we have known Christ after the flesh." As to the first, there can be no question that he refers here to his conversion. He is talking of the Apostolate and the qualifications therefor, and a mere casual sight of Jesus before His death would not in any way give those qualifications; it was that sight of the Risen Christ to which he refers again in the 15th chapter, "last of all he was seen of me also." Professor Bruce¹⁷³ suggests that the reference is not alone or even chiefly to that one experience; but that he is laying stress on the sight of Jesus with the eye of the spirit which he regards as so much more important than the

JESUS AND PAUL

vision with the bodily eye ; while Baur¹⁷⁴ suggests that it is to be classed with the visions and revelations mentioned in the second letter¹⁷⁵ which might appear to some mere creations of imagination, but which were to the Apostle solid and incontestable fact, although belonging only to the sphere of his own immediate consciousness ; but there seems no doubt that it refers to his experiences as a Christian. How then does it stand with the other passage, " though we have known Jesus Christ after the flesh ; " does this refer to anything in his pre-Christian days ? J. Weiss¹⁷⁶ asserts categorically that the words can only mean that Paul had seen and known Jesus in person, in the same way as the men with whom he was arguing had ; declaring very rightly that such merely external knowledge, the knowledge of the man in the street who had simply seen or heard Him sometime during His earthly career was of little value ; that the truly helpful knowledge was spiritual, spiritual knowledge of the spiritual Christ, and that he had and they had not this higher knowledge. But this does not imply that the knowledge according to the flesh has no importance or significance. Paul, he suggests may have several times seen and heard Jesus, may even have been present at His crucifixion, and that these experiences produced a sub-conscious impression which had some share in preparing him for the great change wrought by his experiences on the way to Damas-

PAUL'S ENVIRONMENT

cus. According to this view Paul would have had a really considerable knowledge of Jesus before his conversion, and this would at any rate partly explain why he did not consider it needful immediately after that event to enter into communication with the primitive Apostles with a view to the gaining of such knowledge. Of course this is not the only interpretation of the passage, and some writers¹⁷⁷ excuse themselves on the score of the great variety of interpretation from making any use whatever of the words. Baur¹⁷⁸ refers it simply to the Messianic conception, "If it were the case that formerly I knew no other Messiah than the Messiah of Judaism, such an one as left me under all the peculiar prejudices and materialistic tendencies of my nation and who could not raise me to the new stage of spiritual life on which I now stand, now, etc." Sabatier¹⁷⁹ seems to hold much the same view, but in conjunction with a possible knowledge of Jesus which in accordance with J. Weiss he considers necessary to explain his conversion. Jowett¹⁸⁰ offers a slight variation by suggesting that we have here two stages in the Apostle's preaching, the earlier being when he had preached Christ more in a Jewish and less in a spiritual manner; while another view¹⁸¹ which finds considerable acceptance is that Paul set himself here deliberately to disparage the story of Christ's earthly ministry that he might thereby glorify his own higher knowledge; or even that the

JESUS AND PAUL

earthly life was not real to him ; but that seems to us a quite gratuitous assumption. On the whole, after a careful review of the various interpretations we incline, notwithstanding the strength of those who deny it,¹⁸² to agree with J. Weiss that the passage suggests a real knowledge by Paul of Jesus during His earthly life, although B. Weiss¹⁸³ is of course right when he says that Paul had not enjoyed the personal intercourse with Him by means of which the religious ideas of the original Apostles had been gradually shaped and transformed, and Swete¹⁸⁴ that he here calls attention to the supreme importance of the glorified life of our Lord which an exclusive study of the earthly life might tempt us to neglect.

But further, beyond this definite statement, the Apostle's letters imply a fuller knowledge of Jesus than they formally state. It is always to be borne in mind that they are chiefly letters, occasional letters,¹⁸⁵ not formal epistles, and certainly not Gospels, not intended to give first lessons on the life of Jesus, but written to communities or individuals who have already received this kind of instruction orally, and whose knowledge of these things is tacitly implied, and implying also that knowledge on the part of the one who writes them ; and much of that knowledge would unquestionably have been acquired in his pre-Christian days. Whenever and wherever he got it, there is more than enough in these

PAUL'S ENVIRONMENT

letters concerning the facts about Jesus during His earthly life to enable us to rely firmly on their testimony to the historic reality of Jesus; and this, when we remember their early date is of profound importance; and if it be still said that the quantity is not large we have always to remember the precarious nature of the *argumentum e silentio*,¹⁸⁶ and not infer that he has stated all he knew. This knowledge of the historic Jesus though not the most important is an indispensable pre-requisite to the richer and fuller knowledge; the foundation, soon indeed hidden, but the real basis on which the spiritual experiences and interpretations of after days rest and have been built up. This is one great virtue of Ritschlianism, that it lays such stress on the reality of the human life of Jesus while emphasising in its own way the value of the Divine. To speak of the Divinity of Jesus as a mere judgment of value may have in it possibilities of danger, but is certainly to be preferred to the position of the idealising and symbolising school of to-day, who find no need to think of any human Jesus at all; who have taken away the Lord, and are satisfied with an imagined and imaginary Christ, who is merely the personification of the higher ideals of virtue. To Paul, whatever else He afterward became, Jesus was first the man of Galilee, and any attempt to explain either the life or the writings of Paul without presupposing the actual existence of the historic Jesus is more

JESUS AND PAUL

futile than an endeavour to make bricks without clay.

But we cannot dwell longer on this earlier stage and must pass to the time when he received the richer, spiritual knowledge which made him not only a Christian, but an Apostle—the day of his conversion. What manner of man was he to whom this great experience came? We have a clear note of time in connection with his presence at the martyrdom of Stephen; he was then a young man; while at the other end, in the charming little note to Philemon, he describes himself, perhaps with a touch of the unconscious exaggeration natural to one who has lived an exceptionally strenuous life, as Paul the aged. The question of the chronology of Paul's life has been the subject of an immense amount of minute and interesting research,¹⁸⁷ and though perfect agreement has not been yet reached, there is an approximation toward it which will enable us to draw all the practical conclusions we need. The point about which controversy has chiefly centred is the date¹⁸⁸ of the coming of Festus to Cæsarea which resulted in Paul's being sent to Rome, some recently dating this in 55 instead of 59 or 60 A.D., which had previously been accepted with practical unanimity; but a careful review of the arguments and evidence brought forward on both sides has led us to the conclusion that the suggested earlier date cannot stand, and that the date, circa 60, on which the majority of scholars

PAUL'S ENVIRONMENT

agree¹⁸⁹ may be regarded as most likely ; and on that assumption we can fix with tolerable accuracy the time of the other main events in the Apostle's history. There are indeed two other points on which considerable discussion has taken place, the time of his conversion, and that of his death. In regard to his conversion, Zahn,¹⁹⁰ who accepts Easter 58 as the date of the arrest at Jerusalem, and consequently 52 as that of the Council at Jerusalem, reckons back seventeen years from that to the conversion, on the assumption that Gal. ii. 1-10 refers to the same event as Acts xv. 1-33, and that the three years of Gal. i. 18, are not included in the fourteen years of Gal. ii. 1, but are to be added to these,¹⁹¹ and concludes that the conversion took place in the winter of 34-35, probably the beginning of 35, finding confirmation for this view in the time needed for the events recorded in Acts i.-viii., and the expressions of Acts xxi. 6, and Romans xvi. 7. Of course there are some points here which can only be matters of opinion, but on the whole his criticism of the "New Chronology" which puts the conversion of Paul in the year of Jesus' death seems sound, and consequently while allowing for possible slight changes in some of his figures we feel justified in working practically on the basis of his arrangement.

The date of Paul's death is wrapped in uncertainty, but two theories practically cover the

JESUS AND PAUL

ground ; the one that his execution took place at the close of the two years mentioned in Acts xxviii. 30, the other that he was released and went on a further missionary journey, carrying out his purpose of seeing Spain, and afterward undergoing a second imprisonment, surviving at any rate until the year 64, while several authorities suggest a date as late as 67 A.D. This theory of a release and second imprisonment with further journeying intervening is severely criticised by Baur,¹⁹² and rejected with scorn by Jülicher¹⁹³ who with his wonted vivacity calls it a castle in the air ; but it has strong support¹⁹⁴ and we are inclined to accept it.

What manner of man then was he when he came to the great turning point in his life ? Luke says, as we have seen, that he was at the death of Stephen, a young man ; but from his prominence in the persecution we cannot well imagine him to have been less than thirty years of age. In the full vigour then of early manhood, but when we say full vigour we have to recollect that he was not in some respects a strong man, "in bodily presence weak." Renan¹⁹⁵ has described him in very unflattering terms and there seems little doubt that his sight was bad¹⁹⁶ and that he suffered from epilepsy¹⁹⁷ like Julius Caesar, Oliver Cromwell, Napoleon Bonaparte and others of the world's great leaders. But with all his drawbacks he must have been a man of immense vitality and energy ; the record both

PAUL'S ENVIRONMENT

of what he did and what he endured shows us a man putting the work of three ordinary lives into one, both in toil and suffering. Like another great though small religious leader, John Wesley, he seems to have been capable of an almost incredible amount of exertion and endurance.

But his mental outstripped his physical powers ; Paul was one of the great geniuses¹⁹⁸ of all time. Weinell¹⁹⁹ graphically describes him as "a hero of thought," not by any means indeed a perfect logician, but a man who could see the inner realities of things and weld them together into a system which whatever its defects, has had a marvellous attraction for strong thinkers in all ages. But his defects as well as his excellences were in great measure temperamental ; a man of intense passionateness,²⁰⁰ and yet of rare sanity and moderation ;²⁰¹ men have found in him the extremes both of optimism and pessimism ; hopeful to the point of sometimes almost believing the impossible, at other times almost doubting his most cherished hopes. Another feature of his character, his wonderful tact has been often misunderstood. Wrede²⁰² says, "his letters contain traces of a certain pliancy, one might almost say policy," and Weinell,²⁰³ "he is the first to practise with worldly-wise shrewdness the delicate art of policy, the art of the 'possible.' " In our judgment the reproach is undeserved ; while a man of exceptional tact,

JESUS AND PAUL

Paul was also a man of exceptional honesty and straightforwardness, willing as we see in his controversy with Peter, to run the risk of the shipwreck of his most cherished plans rather than sacrifice what he believed to be the truth. The most marked features in his character were singleness of purpose and intensity of temper. What he believed, he believed with all his heart ; what he did, he did with all his might. There was nothing passive, lukewarm or indifferent about him ; the whole man was in every conviction and in every act.²⁰⁴ Whether as a Pharisee or as a Christian, he was dominated by a single aim and threw himself into its accomplishment with an earnestness which could brook no opposition. With all his originality, freshness and depth of thought, he was essentially a man of one idea, willing to sacrifice everything to it, willing to die on its behalf ; the very stuff that martyrs are made of. Again he was intensely human, Ramsay ²⁰⁵ says, " the fascination of his personality lies in his humanity. The ablest and greatest thinker, the most creative mind, the boldest originator, the most skilful organizer and administrator, the cleverest and most brilliant of the Apostles ; St. Paul lies closer to the heart of the great mass of readers than any other of the Apostles, and the reason is that he impresses us as the most purely and intensely human of them all."

One other element and that the greatest re-

PAUL'S ENVIRONMENT

mains, his genius for religion, without which all else is unintelligible. "St. Paul is one of the few men to whom the much abused expression, 'religious genius' may legitimately be applied. His is a mystical and prophetic nature and in comparison with this the theological element vanishes almost entirely; St. Paul is, in the deepest sense of the word, by the grace of God 'homo religiosus.'" ²⁰⁶ Paul was an intensely religious man before he became a Christian, just as he was a Jewish theologian before he became the great theologian of Christianity, and both his religion and his theology have to be borne in mind in endeavouring to estimate the nature and force of the wonderful change that came over him on that significant day. The whole of Paul's Christian theology from whatever sources he drew its forms of expression was based on his personal experience,²⁰⁷ but that experience itself implied and had as its foundation his religious experience before he became a Christian. Paul was never at any time, like so many men, indifferent to religion. Deissmann²⁰⁸ in a passage of rare delicacy and beauty sketches the first awakening in Paul's soul of the consciousness of sin with its consequent feeling of guilt and need of pardon, which drove him to the strictest religious denomination of his people and time, and which finds its echoes in both the confessions and the enthusiasms of the later years. He had a natural bent toward religion. The strong vein of mysticism²⁰⁹ so evident in

JESUS AND PAUL

Paul the Christian, was unquestionably present in Paul the Pharisee, and gives the clue not only to his conversion to Christianity, but to the persecuting earnestness which formed the immediate antecedent to that conversion.

CHAPTER IV

PAUL THE CHRISTIAN

TO this wonderfully complex nature with its high lights and deep shadows, its almost incredible syntheses and contradictions, its overwhelming sense of sin and overpowering longing for goodness, came the experience we call his conversion, an experience which has done almost more than any other single event to change the course of history. What was it, and how did it come about? While it came upon him unawares it certainly did not come upon him unprepared. Paul had been puzzling for years over the problem of salvation. His was one of those natures that cannot rest content without assurance and so far he had not got it; but with the experience of that day he got it, and it never left him again. The endeavours to explain the event are singularly varied, but a large number are altogether wanting in value because they tacitly, if not formally, ignore the one really essential element, that perhaps indefinable but clearly recognisable reality in it, which we call spiritual experience. Psychology has made wonderful strides in recent years, but there are some things that have so far defied its finest analysis and this is one of them;

JESUS AND PAUL

it is a thing which can only be spiritually discerned. Paul was an intensely religious man, but a man so far not satisfied with the religion he had got ; a man who, like so many of his fellow-countrymen and co-religionists was looking for something better, with a strong if sometimes vague belief that God, in whom he believed with all his soul, would send one specially fitted and prepared to bring to their hearts the truth they longed to know. These beliefs centred round and crystallized in the hope of the Messiah, but it is necessary to bear always in mind that Paul's thoughts about the Messiah in his pre-Christian days were essentially spiritual, religious and theological ; not like those of so many of his contemporaries, political and social.

A vast amount of study has been given in recent years to the question of the Jewish conceptions²¹⁰ of the Messiah, and the results if not so definite or conclusive as some would desire, do help us in some measure to understand better the circumstances in which Christianity took its rise, and some of the fundamental conceptions with which Jesus and his first followers had to deal. Schweitzer²¹¹ is unduly pessimistic on the point ; "What was the nature of the contemporary Jewish world of thought? To that no clear answer can be given. We do not know whether the expectation of the Messiah was generally current or whether it was the faith of a mere sect. With the Mosaic religion as such

PAUL THE CHRISTIAN

it had nothing to do. There was no organic connexion between the religion of legal observance and the future hope. Further if the eschatological hope was generally current, was it the prophetic or the apocalyptic form of that hope? We know the Messianic expectations of the prophets; we know the apocalyptic picture as drawn by Daniel and following him, by Enoch and the Psalms of Solomon before the coming of Jesus, and by the Apocalypses of Ezra and Baruch about the time of the destruction of Jerusalem; but we do not know which was the popular form, nor supposing both were combined into one picture what this picture really looked like."

The case, however, is not so bad as this extract would suggest. The researches of Charles²¹² and others in recent years have made this field much more accessible and its contents more intelligible, and we shall probably be able to accept many of the conclusions arrived at in this department as being quite as worthy of credit as those arrived at in many other branches of historical research, and more credible than some of the positions arrived at by Schweitzer himself. Schürer in his admirable summary of the Messianic doctrinal theology, speaking of the Messianic hope says, ²¹³ "Whether pre-Christian Judaism regarded the Messiah as simply human or a being of a higher order, and especially whether it attributed to him pre-existence, cannot with the

JESUS AND PAUL

uncertainty about the dates of the authorities be positively decided. The original Messianic hope did not expect an individual Messiah at all, but theocratic kings of the house of David. Subsequently, the hope was consolidated and raised more and more into the expectation of a personal Messiah as a ruler endowed by God with special gifts and powers. In the time of Christ this form had at all events long been the prevailing one. Of course the more exceptional the position awarded to the Messiah, the more does he step forth from ordinary human limits ; and in the freedom with which the religious circle of ideas moved, this was effected in very different fashions ; but in general the Messiah was thought of as a human king and ruler, but as one endowed by God with special gifts and powers." Gardner²¹⁴ who has given considerable attention to this matter carries it a little further when he says, " it has been shown by recent research that the notion of an exalted spiritual Messiah who should come from heaven and who was to return thither, who was to be no mere earthly king and conqueror but a great angelic being, was by no means uncommon among the Jews at the time of the birth of Jesus, but shadowed forth in the Psalms of Solomon and the book of Enoch."

There is no question that the primitive confession of the early disciples centred round the acknowledgment of Jesus as the Messiah, and it is probably little less certain that this was the very point which

PAUL THE CHRISTIAN

specially roused the anger and stirred up the persecuting spirit of Paul. Consequently, before we can grasp the meaning of the event on the road to Damascus we have to arrive at some conclusion as to the nature of the Messianic conception as it existed in the mind of Paul previous to his conversion, and as it existed in the mind of the early Church in those first days in Jerusalem when Paul came in contact with it. Schweitzer, as we saw above, speaks of two special forms, the prophetic and the apocalyptic, and inclines strongly to the view that the conception in the mind of Jesus and probably in that of his first followers was apocalyptic and specially that form which he calls late-Jewish which he draws from the Apocalypses of Baruch and Ezra. That such conceptions were current about that time, that they would probably be known to Paul and also to the primitive disciples may be readily granted without at all admitting as Schweitzer seems to suggest that they explain not only the whole Messianic conception of primitive Christianity, but practically the whole of Christianity itself. Although we often find ourselves in opposition to Drews, we agree in great measure with the stress he lays upon Isaiah's conception of the servant of the Lord and especially the wonderful portrait of the 53rd chapter as a main element in the framing of the primitive conception of the Messiah. We cannot exclude either the prophetic or the apocalyptic element ;

JESUS AND PAUL

both were probably swirling in the mind of Paul as he heard the testimonies of the Apostles to Jesus as the Messiah ; and just because he was so intensely in earnest to get a true answer to his life's problem, he felt bound to oppose what seemed to him at the time an unjustifiable claim on the part of these men on behalf of Jesus. To Paul, the Messiah must be the suffering servant of the Lord, but he must also be the Lord from heaven ; one who in some as yet inexplicable way came forth from God, and was yet manifest in the chosen people ; the one who should usher in the day of the Lord. Almost all that the Apostles said about Jesus as Messiah would fit in with what he had previously learnt and thought out for himself on the point, but one point he could not reach—they spoke of Jesus as having risen from the dead—and that he simply could not believe. That was the point that raised such an intensity of feeling within him ; for if only he could have believed it the whole scheme of thought would be harmonious ; one raised from the dead must have some special favour in God's sight, some special claim upon God's love, and therefore be chosen and prepared by God to do some very special work for Him ; but all this talk about resurrection was mere folly, nay worse, it was imposture, and as impostors the Christians deserved the worst punishment that could be inflicted on them, so he persecuted them. But the persecution failed

PAUL THE CHRISTIAN

to shake them, and inevitably in a mind of the religious intensity of Paul's the question was bound soon to rise, is it all imposture, or are they speaking what they believe to be true? That was the question that was surging in his mind even while he went to Damascus to continue the persecution, and, on the way to Damascus he met Jesus, and immediately knew, with a conviction that nothing henceforth would or could shake, that the testimony of the people he had been persecuting was true: Jesus who had died was alive, and that very Jesus was the long looked for and hoped for Messiah.²¹⁵ How did that change of belief come about? Let us emphasise clearly the point, that Paul believed as firmly as the other Apostles in regard to the Risen Christ that the person who appeared to him on the road to Damascus was the same Jesus with whom the other disciples had companied during His pre-crucifixion life; with whom they had sat at table in Capernaum, or sailed on the Lake of Galilee, and whom they firmly believed to have appeared to them afterward. The endeavour to detach Paul's belief from that of the other Apostles, saying that he saw "the Christ" as distinguished from Jesus²¹⁶ would take all meaning both out of the history of his relations with the other disciples when he became a Christian, and also out of all his references to Jesus in his letters. Those references may not be either as numerous or as full as many apolo-

JESUS AND PAUL

gists would wish, but they are both numerous and full enough to justify the assertion that he like the other disciples believed he had seen alive the Jesus who had been crucified on Calvary, and that he regarded the evidence for this belief in his case as quite as strong and clear as that on which the other disciples based their belief. It will of course be asked how did he know that the one who appeared to him on the Damascus road was the Jesus who had been crucified? In the first place as we have seen above, it is quite likely that he knew Jesus by sight, and as the other disciples recognised Him with whom they had lived and worked, so Paul may have recognised Him whom he had seen and disliked; but in the second place, the important part of the impression made upon him by Jesus was not physical, but spiritual; quite as much if not even more than the impression Jesus made upon the other disciples and which convinced them that He was risen. Of course we know that we are touching on a sphere in which knowledge so far is often vague and indefinite, a sphere which shelters many of the vagaries and impostures of spiritualism and pseudo-miracles, but we have to be watchful not to lose the things that are true ^{216a} in the mist engendered by hypocrisy and imposture, and the thing that is true is spiritual experience, the experience of the real presence of Him who died and rose again. For the important point in connection with Paul especially is that

PAUL THE CHRISTIAN

he was constantly in touch with Jesus the Christ all through his life as a Christian, and that he taught that a like spiritual experience was open to and should be shared by every one who in true faith surrendered himself to this Jesus Christ as his Saviour and Master. It is the reality of this spiritual experience which is the core and kernel of the conversion of Paul, an experience which is not to be sublimated into subjective vision or hallucination or imagination. Of course reference is often made to the visions mentioned in 2 Cor. xii., and it is suggested²¹⁷ that the experience at the conversion was of the same class, but the fact that he speaks of them in the way that he does, so differently from his statements in regard to his experience at his conversion, seems to make this suggestion futile. Moreover this suggestion is linked to the further suggestion that the other Apostles' knowledge of Jesus as risen was on the same level as that of these visions and ecstasies of Paul described in 2 Cor. xii., and therefore reduces those experiences of the other Apostles to mere subjective hallucinations which would utterly fail to account for the change wrought in their lives by their faith in the resurrection of Jesus. Deissmann²¹⁸ truly says, "Here as with the appearances of Christ to Peter and the others who saw Him at the first Easter, we shall never succeed in unravelling the experience psychologically and analysing it without any residue, but we can state with great

JESUS AND PAUL

certainty how Paul conceived the incident." That is the point of fundamental importance ; whether we describe the experience as subjective or objective or subjective-objective, to Paul the fact was clear that the Jesus who had died was living and alive for evermore ; God had revealed His Son in him and to him, and the revelation revolutionised his life.

We have now to deal with an entirely different person though identically the same as before his conversion. Paul the persecuting Pharisee and Paul the Christian missionary are as violent contrasts as could well be imagined, and yet the old Paul has always to be borne in mind in estimating the new. Paul is now a Christian, and by a Christian he means, as he is fond of putting it, " a slave of Jesus Christ." There was never any doubt in his own mind as to the relation between them. Jesus the Christ was his Redeemer, his Lord, his Master, to whom he looked up with adoring gratitude, whom he served with passionate loyalty ; his whole life was given up to the work of glorifying Him. But he also believed that Christ had honoured him by choosing and calling and equipping him to be an Apostle and missionary for Him, and specially to undertake a branch of work to which the other Apostles do not seem to have felt themselves called, the proclamation of Jesus the Christ as the Saviour of all men, not merely Jews ; as the hope of the world, not simply of Israel. There has been

PAUL THE CHRISTIAN

considerable discussion as to when this larger and richer conception came to him. As a pious Pharisee such an idea would probably be rather the reverse of attractive to him, although it has to be borne in mind that there was a considerable amount of proselytising work done by Jews, and that their noblest ideals always contemplated the time when "the mountain of the Lord's house should be established in the top of the mountains, and all nations should flow unto it."²¹⁹ Jewish piety then, like Catholic piety now, was able to combine the narrowest conception of its own claim to be the only true religion with an earnest enthusiasm to bring all other nations within the scope of its blessings if only they would accept its conditions; and the zeal of Mohammedan missionaries to-day is evidence that the missionary vocation is by no means inconsistent with the Semitic temperament and habits. It has been said that his persecuting zeal was utterly inconsistent with the position of a missionary, but the story of persecutions by Christian and other propagandists who have so cheerfully and zealously burnt heretics for the glory of the Lord, gives quite sufficient warrant for the idea that Paul, whether Christian or not would certainly have been a missionary, and that he may quite possibly before his conversion have contemplated the duty of taking the truth, as he conceived it, to other nations than his own.²²⁰ That the conditions under which they were to be

JESUS AND PAUL

brought in were indeed entirely changed by his conversion is obvious, not only from the conflict which arose on this point between him and the other Apostles, but from the difference in the methods of propaganda which he practised before and after ; but there is no reason to think that his universalism may not have already been active in his mind and received concentration and crystallisation in the experience of his call at Damascus, and the unkindly reception with²²¹ which his early efforts as a preacher of Jesus were met by his compatriots.

But neither temperament nor environment will completely account either for the Apostle or the missionary ; for this we have always to fall back on his spiritual experience ; the sense of the Divine in Jesus that he grasped when God was pleased to reveal His Son in him ; that was what made him apostle and missionary to the whole wide world. It was that also which kept him from being merely an "apokalyptiker." His conception of the person and work of Jesus cannot be fully explained by the idea of a near end of the world to be preceded by the coming or the coming again of the Son of man. As Gardner²²² says, "while he looked for the Parousia, it did not dominate his imagination, save now and then ; the present kingdom furnished the great end and purpose of his practical life." Of course Schweitzer may have something entirely fresh to present when he brings out

PAUL THE CHRISTIAN

his promised work on "*the Pauline mysticism*," but so far his exclusively eschatological conception of the gospel does not carry conviction to us. Paul was more than an enthusiast for the Parousia.

How far was he a scientific theologian? Wernle²²³ says he has given us the first great system of Christian apologetics, and has drawn out with considerable elaboration instances of what seem to him the choicest work of the Apostle as an apologist; and in this he is treading in the footsteps of Baur and Holsten²²⁴ who, accepting what Kaftan²²⁵ calls an old prejudice, maintained that we must take the Apostle strictly as a theologian whose letters are brief statements of dogmatics. The same position, for very different reasons has been taken up by the Dutch school²²⁶ and their supporters. The general opinion²²⁷ is however strongly in the opposite direction; that there is no formal system of theology, but that the theology is inspired by and flows from the Apostle's experience, and in its very want of system shows clearly its origin. "St. Paul is essentially a hero of piety first and foremost. That which is theological is secondary with him. He is far more a man of prayer and witness, a confessor and prophet, than a learned exegete and brooding dogmatist."²²⁸ There is theology and much of it, but it is there not because he wished to produce theology, but because he had

JESUS AND PAUL

certain definite spiritual experiences, and put down what seemed to him their best interpretation.

In the same way, though not a professed ethical teacher, his work was shot through and through with the highest ethical teaching. Kaftan²²⁹ indeed describes him as the typical ethical teacher of Christendom, and Gardner²³⁰ says that in the problems of conduct we find the charts drawn up by Paul of the greatest value ; a very different estimate from the grudging acknowledgment of Wrede.²³¹

But while is he one of the world's great ethical masters, ethics is for him no detached subject with some philosophical basis of its own ; through every page shine the aim and character and spirit of a divine life ; the ethics are the fruit, but the root is the spiritual experience. Weinel^{231a} finely says, "Through Paul the moral life of mankind has been enriched by the realisation of the truth that morality in the full sense of the word and in its highest development can only blossom in the fiery heat of religious enthusiasm ; try as hard as he would, brace his will as much as he could, he found it impossible to lead a truly moral life on the basis of the categorical imperative ; a new element was needed, a religious transformation of the whole man who begins his life afresh in reliance on the loving Father of all men."

Paul the Apostle, Paul the missionary, Paul

PAUL THE CHRISTIAN

the apocalyptic enthusiast, Paul the theologian, and Paul the ethical teacher find their explanation and justification in Paul the mystic, the man who realised Christ in him, the hope of glory.

CHAPTER V

PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF JESUS.

But what was the conception of Jesus in the mind and heart of Paul, and what relation did it bear to those of the primitive Apostles and earliest disciples, and what to the Master's own thoughts of Himself? One point to be borne in mind in endeavouring to answer these questions is the time limit; that we have practically to deal only with conceptions that arose before the year 70 A.D. It is neither our province nor our purpose to deal with the inferences that the makers of creeds and theological systems have drawn from the experiences or statements of Paul. These may be both valuable and important or otherwise, but they lie outside the scope of our present endeavour and we shall not touch upon them.

It would be of immense value for our endeavour if we had good specimens of Paul's preaching and specially of his early sermons, but the material of this kind is scanty. The discourse delivered at Athens was manifestly determined both as to form and content by his surroundings, and probably bears little if any relation to his ordinary mission preaching. The speeches on his arrest

PAUL'S CONCEPT

and trial in Jerusalem are rather forensic and apologetic than evangelistic, and have probably been edited by the composer of the book in which they occur. The exhortation in the synagogue in Pisidian Antioch²³² comes nearer to our requirements, but there is a family likeness between this and the discourses ascribed to other preachers in the book which makes us hesitate as to how far we can regard it as characteristically Pauline. But it is not to be put aside as useless. It contains most if not all of the essentials which the Apostle recapitulates in his summary of his gospel in the first letter to the Corinthians,²³³ and probably gives a not unfair idea of many of his synagogue utterances as a mission preacher.

But the very scantiness of this material throws into greater relief the high value of the letters as sources, and to them we shall therefore practically confine ourselves.

It is often asked is there any development in the theology of Paul as we have it in his letters? In seeking an answer to that question we have to remember that none of the letters we have was written less than fifteen years after his conversion; and it has been pertinently asked,²³⁴ "Is a man between thirty and forty-five after an experience which transformed his whole inner world and regarding the meaning of which he had leisure for meditation more likely to have advanced theologically, or a man between forty-five and fifty-five subject to a constant strain of

JESUS AND PAUL

travel, labour and service? Between Romans and Ephesians only about five years at most can have elapsed, and Paul was then a man over fifty. Can any marked change of theological view be regarded as at all probable at that age, in so short a time, without any inward crisis which would compel re-consideration of long-held convictions? "

The protagonist of the theory of development is of course Sabatier, who has worked out an elaborate scheme which has scarcely won acceptance. The controversy on the subject has been immense; but the difference between the controversialists is by no means so great as the extent of the writing might suggest. Of course we have no hesitation in ruling out the rationalistic theories which postulate as a beginning a small indefinite basis of apostolic tradition to be recognised by its primitive and natural way of regarding Jesus, and its intensely Jewish characteristics; and at the other end a highly developed system of specifically Christian conceptions, based on the spiritual and speculative wisdom and the universalistic outlook represented by the later Epistles. But putting that aside, it is not necessary to suppose that Paul in his earlier letters told us all that was in his mind at that time; and there is a good deal to be said, *e.g.*, in favour of the theory of Bruce²³⁵ that we may look on the letters to the Thessalonians as a kind of Christian primer for elementary Christians,

PAUL'S CONCEPT

and that in endeavouring to grasp his thought we must distinguish between his religious intuitions, his theological formulations, and his apologetic buttresses. Jowett²³⁶ seems to have touched the kernel of the matter sixty years ago when he wrote, "there is a growth in the Epistles of St. Paul it is true, but it is the growth of Christian life, not of intellectual progress, the growth not of reflection, but of spiritual experience."

Jesus.—Starting then with the letter to the Galatians, we are met at the outset with the phrase²³⁷ "Jesus Christ and God who raised Him from the dead," which contains the germ of most if not all that follows. We note first the presence of the name Jesus, which occurs so constantly, and by its very repetition disposes effectually of the suggestion that Paul knew nothing of and cared nothing for the historic Jesus. We have already seen²³⁸ that it is most probable that Paul had acquired a considerable knowledge of the earthly life of Jesus during his pre-Christian days, but that knowledge would have been considerably enlarged when he became a Christian. Although he says distinctly²³⁹ that he did not go up to Jerusalem to see the Apostles for three years after his conversion; in the narrative in the Acts²⁴⁰ we are told that he was certain days with the disciples at Damascus who would no doubt have told him all they knew, and the same chapter says he preached boldly at Damascus in

JESUS AND PAUL

the name of Jesus. The humanity of Jesus was certainly a reality to him then. In the letters we have much fuller references:—Gal. iv. 4, "God sent forth His Son born of a woman, born subject to law"; Rom. i. 3, "Jesus Christ our Lord was made of the seed of David according to the flesh"; Rom. v. 15, "One man, Jesus Christ"; Rom. viii. 3, "God sent His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh"; Rom. ix. 5, "my kinsmen . . . of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came"; Philip. ii. 7, "Christ Jesus . . . was made in the likeness of men and found in fashion as a man"; 1 Tim. ii. 5, "The man, Christ Jesus." It has been suggested that some of these passages suggest docetism, but beside the facts that some of the statements above definitely refute such a view, any such interpretation would conflict with the whole tenor of the Apostle's thinking about Jesus, and would certainly have brought him into most serious conflict with the other Apostles of which we hear absolutely nothing. As to any further inferences to be drawn from them beyond the fact of His genuine humanity, we cannot agree with those²⁴¹ who detect in Gal. iv. 4, a hidden reference to the Virgin birth, a dogma which probably did not come to light until after his time; nor with those who would see in the phrase "sinful flesh" an evidence that He was the subject of original sin. On the other hand the beautiful reminder of Philip. ii. 5, "let that mind be in you which was

PAUL'S CONCEPT

also in Christ Jesus," furnishes clear evidence of the Apostle's knowledge²⁴² of the wonderful meekness and self-abnegation which formed such marked characteristics of the man Jesus; and Gal. iii. 13, describes His crucifixion as man.

As to the nature of His humanity the Apostle wisely refrains from any attempts at definition, and especially we can find no warrant in him for the strange theory which has been so widely and influentially advocated, that His humanity was "impersonal;"²⁴³ or as Dr. Moberly²⁴⁴ puts it that "Christ was not generically, but inclusively man." The conception of personality is perhaps the most difficult of any to define accurately, but we must not, in order to explain a fact so admittedly mysterious as the Person of Jesus the Christ, throw ourselves into inextricable confusion by destroying the notion of personality. Sanday²⁴⁵ has put the point sanely when he says, "Christ is in fact a Divine Person, but a Divine Person expressing Himself in terms of humanity; there was in Him no impersonal humanity, which is impossible, but a human nature and character which were personal because they were now the method and condition of His own Personality:" to which we may add the words of Dr. Temple,²⁴⁶ "We must not form a conception of humanity and either ask if Christ is human or insist on reducing Him to the limits of our conception; we must ask what

JESUS AND PAUL

is Humanity and look to Christ to find the answer."

Another question which arises in connection with the humanity of Jesus is His sinlessness, and on this the testimony of the Apostle is both clear²⁴⁷ and valuable.²⁴⁸ In 2 Cor. v. 21, he says distinctly, "He knew no sin," while such passages as Rom. viii. 3, and Philip. ii. 8, have this as their underlying presupposition; and B. Weiss²⁴⁹ well points out that Paul's conviction that Jesus was the Christ implied belief in His sinlessness; unless he had believed this he could not have accepted Him as Messiah. Paul felt no need for reiteration on this point; it was so absolutely proved for him by all he had heard of Jesus, that the contrary was for him (as it has been for Christians all down the ages) unthinkable. But the Apostle not merely asserts the genuine humanity of Jesus and shows his knowledge of His character and disposition, he also knows²⁵⁰ much of and bases his own teaching on the teaching of Jesus while He was on the earth. Numerous parallels to the sayings of Jesus have been noted in Paul's ethical teaching and these references are undoubtedly merely samples of his practice in his oral instruction; as Professor C. A. Scott²⁵¹ says, "It is only the habit of putting almost exclusive emphasis on the theology of Paul which has blinded many to the wonder of the ethical harmony between himself and his Master."

But when we have said all we can, we have to

PAUL'S CONCEPT

admit that Paul does not really tell us very much about Jesus in His earthly life ; very few new facts, very few fresh sayings, and very few even of those which we learn of elsewhere. Yet the reasons are obvious and ample :—(1) that these facts and sayings were already well known to those to whom he was writing ; and (2) that Jesus Christ the Lord was something very different from ordinary men, and it was the things that differentiated him from ordinary men, not those which He had in common with them which were of chief importance in Paul's eyes. He tells us very carefully of His Resurrection, giving us here some facts not told elsewhere ; and in order to show the reality of the resurrection he mentions the death and burial of the Master. He gives a very beautiful account of the institution of the Holy Communion, which is so little to the taste of some radical critics that they cannot content themselves with throwing doubt on the whole of his letters, but insist that this must be an interpolation, though why they should trouble themselves to suggest interpolations in forged or pseudonymous letters written 150 years later than the events they profess to describe is beyond our powers of comprehension. The facts he relates are few, but in " this detachment from the historical basis of his religion " as it has been phrased, Paul is by no means alone. Thompson well²⁵² points out that the way in which he introduces his accounts of the Last

JESUS AND PAUL

Supper and the Resurrection appearances show that he is handing on a tradition he had received, and in the former case at any rate he believes it rests on Jesus' own authority. If he shares a common tradition, he shares also a common indifference to what falls outside that tradition. The Gospel of the early Christians is also the Gospel of the Passion and the Resurrection. This is a point which is often overlooked, more often perhaps unrecognised. The tendency now-a-days, at least with very many, is to lay all their stress on the human life of Jesus and to fancy that it has always been so ; but that is not the case. It was not merely the impression of His marvellous personality as a wonderful man, but the impression of *something more*, certified specially by the fact of the Resurrection that put a meaning into both the life and death of Jesus which absolutely marked Him off from other men, and it was this "something more" that arrested the attention, aroused the faith, and inspired the passion of the early Christians. They had no doubt about the facts of His earthly life ; they were too well known for that, and it was not until after the lapse of some years, when sceptics outside the community began to question the historical existence of a man who had been so different from other men, that His followers began to collect and put into writing all they could recall of His life on earth. Nor did their spiritual instinct mislead them. Beautiful as is

PAUL'S CONCEPT

the earthly life of Jesus, wonderful as are His words of high and pure ethical teaching, these are not, never have been, and never will be the most precious part of the treasure which Jesus the Christ brought to this earth. It is the something more, the something more which marks Him out from us men, which is best worth knowing and best worth preserving now and always.

The Christ.—What is the something more? The first aspect under which it presented itself to Paul was that this is "the Christ." We have said something of the popular conceptions associated with this name in the time of the Apostle, and we suggested above²⁵³ some of the elements in Paul's pre-Christian conception, and certainly all these, as well as other elements are to be found in the Christ of Paul the Apostle. It has been said²⁵⁴ indeed that Paul knows nothing of the argument from Isa. liii., as to the suffering servant of the Lord. Bacon²⁵⁵ says it is significant that the only use made by Paul of this Isaiahan type of Christological doctrine is in the passage²⁵⁶ where he refers to the gospel teaching received from his predecessors in the faith; but surely he has forgotten the whole tone of the letter to the Romans and the beautiful statement of 2 Cor. v., 14, 15. Whence he obtained this feature of his teaching is indeed open to question. There is very little trace of it in pre-Christian Jewish literature, and the view we meet with in the books of the Maccabees that the sufferings of the

JESUS AND PAUL

righteous served as vicarious expiation for the sins of their fellows, does not explain all that was in Paul's mind. The supposed derivation from the ethnic conception of the dying and rising god, Tammuz, Adonis, etc., on which Drews and others lay such stress, is no more than a coincidence and a very imperfect one at that. It is probable that the idea is distinctively Christian;²⁵⁷ possibly a revelation of the Master Himself.²⁵⁸ It was certainly present in the earlier conceptions of the primitive Church,²⁵⁹ to whom it was a special glory of Christ that "He died for our sins," and Paul may well have learnt it from them. It has indeed been suggested²⁶⁰ that the first attempts at thus interpreting the death of Jesus may have been due to the controversies of the early Christians with the non-Christian Jews; the Jews interpreting the death of Jesus as a divine punishment for his own sins; the Christians to whom the spotless life of their Master was an incontestable proof of sinlessness, saying that He was punished for the sins of others; some suggesting the sinful Jews who did not believe; others, with truer instinct, realising that their own as well as others' sins needed in some way to be atoned for, saying "He died for our sins." Whatever its source, the thought was for Paul one fundamental element in his conception of Jesus the Christ; He is the One through whom sinners receive forgiveness, atonement, reconciliation.

This subject of the meaning of the death of

PAUL'S CONCEPT

Christ brings us into the very heart of the Pauline theology, but we have only to consider it herein so far as it throws light on Paul's conception of his Master. He does not indeed as some have done find the work of salvation in the death of Jesus alone ; but there is no question that it had in his eyes tremendous importance ; that in some way redemption, both justification and sanctification ; the taking away of condemnation and the beginning of new life for all men who will accept the conditions on which it is offered—the reconciliation of sinful humanity to their heavenly Father—all in some way in his judgment take their rise in the death followed by the resurrection and exaltation of Christ, and that therefore a death with consequences so wonderful implies something very wonderful in Him who thereby accomplishes such tremendous results.

We have of course to realise that we are now in the sphere of interpretation, but it is interpretation of facts, the facts of the Apostle's own spiritual experience ;²⁶¹ his knowledge of salvation. He had passed from death unto life and the fundamental factor in the change had been Jesus the Christ. He feels himself to be a new man ; how is that to be explained ? The answer is, through Christ, Jesus the Christ who has died for him, who has risen again, for him ; and who now in spiritual reality and power dwells within him and is the very source of his new life

JESUS AND PAUL

so that it is no longer he that lives but Christ, Jesus the Christ who lives in him. We cannot indeed rightly conceive his interpretation of Christ's death unless we take it in its connection with His resurrection and His new risen life ; but the Risen Christ and the spiritually present Living Christ could never have been except for the earthly life and death of Jesus. He by His death had won what no other man had ever won before, a perfect victory over sin ; and those who are spiritually united to Him, those in whom He now lives, share in some measure in that death and its victory.

Death to sin, victory over sin, are the infallible tokens of the real presence of the Lord Jesus in the life of His followers:

Without interpreting it in the "physical" manner of Schweitzer we need to keep our hold on the connection of the death of Jesus with all that follows, as the first link in the chain which unites man with God ; the death of Christ in its effects shows that He is something more than other men.

But stronger than his thought of Jesus who died is his conception of Jesus the Christ as the Risen One.²⁶² On the Resurrection of Jesus Paul gives no uncertain sound, and it is simply childish, in view of his repeated references to the Resurrection, to say as is so often said that Paul knows only of a heavenly not an earthly Christ. Whatever Jesus was shown by the

PAUL'S CONCEPT

Resurrection to be, it was Jesus, the Jesus whom the other Apostles had known so intimately, who had been raised up. Had there been any difference between Paul and the other Apostles on this point we should certainly have heard of it; indeed we may say that had Paul differed from them on this point we should never have heard of him at all as an Apostle of Jesus Christ, but there is none, their testimony, whatever differences there may be in points of detail, is in perfect accord on the main fact, God has raised Jesus from the dead.

As to the nature of the Risen Christ we can readily admit that Paul dwells far more on the spiritual than on the physical side. He makes a clear distinction in the famous chapter on the resurrection between the earthly and the spiritual body, and he implies there, and in the letter to the Philippians²⁶³ distinctly asserts that the Lord's resurrection body was something very different from the earthly one, and Dr. Simpson²⁶⁴ well observes that it is the appearance of Christ to him which underlies his analysis of the resurrection state. We think he also rightly^{264a} lays emphasis on the value of Paul's teaching on this matter, when he says that it is in Paul and not in the Evangelists that we find the profounder teaching, whether as to the Resurrection of Christ or that of Christians, and that the solution of any difficulty in harmonising their respective statements lies in recognising that the Evangelists

JESUS AND PAUL

deal specially with the earthly, Paul specially with the risen state. As to the nature of this resurrection body, the Apostle exercises a wise reticence, a reticence whose wisdom is all the more apparent when contrasted with the speculations²⁶⁵ of later days. B. Weiss²⁶⁶ is probably going almost beyond the pale of legitimate interpretation when he says, "Paul has transformed the idea of the divine $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ which Jesus claims for Himself, and which the original Apostles ascribe to the exalted Christ, into an altogether concrete notion; a heavenly radiant light proceeding from a supramundane source of light which forms to him the antithesis of every earthly materiality, and out of which are formed the bodies of the heavenly, a glorified corporeity." The danger of his speculation will be seen in the further fancy of Pfleiderer²⁶⁷ (which Weiss rejects) that the Pauline $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ is in itself a transcendent physical essence, a supersensuous kind of matter. Schweitzer's view, which seems akin to this, of something "naturhaft," which his translator renders with hesitation "physical,"²⁶⁸ merely glosses over the difficulty by giving an indefinite meaning to a word which has already a well-recognised connotation, although we readily admit that the expression "spiritual body" is by no means free from difficulty. Sir Oliver Lodge²⁶⁹ wisely says "the real meaning of the term body as connoting anything which is able to manifest

PAUL'S CONCEPT

feelings, emotions and thoughts, and at the same time to operate efficiently on its environment should be emphasised ; and the temporary character of the present human body should be freely admitted, although it usefully and truthfully displays the incarnate part of us during the brief episode of terrestrial life." With that proviso, we may express our agreement with Kennedy²⁷⁰ that "the objective impression which Paul received of his Lord was manifestly that which he would describe as a *σῶμα πνευματικόν*, and the appearances of Christ to the other disciples adjust themselves with remarkable accuracy to the same idea."

But this is by no means the whole of the contribution which the fact of the Resurrection made to his conception of Jesus the Christ ; it opened the way to fuller views both of His Person and work, and of His relations with His people. When we link together the declarations of Rom. i., 4, "Jesus Christ was declared to be the Son of God in power according to the spirit of holiness by the resurrection from the dead," and Gal. i., 16, "it pleased God to reveal His Son in me," we have a very helpful light for the interpretation of his experience in the great crisis of his life on the way to Damascus. That experience was a revelation of the Son of God, and within him. Hitherto he had been conscious of an overwhelming power of sin ; now that was gone ; and what had taken it away was the

JESUS AND PAUL

definite consciousness that Jesus who had died was living, and living in him, the power to overcome evil. The old crushing sense of slavery to sin was utterly gone ; he felt free, free to do the right ; and yet he knew it was not he himself who had effected the change or was carrying out the new programme ; it was Christ in him ; and Christ could be that and do that because He held a unique relation to God ; and that unique relation was made manifest by the unique event of the Resurrection. He was declared to be the Son of God in Power, the "strong Son of God," by the Resurrection, which began His new life as the Power of God in man. This Lord Jesus Christ, God's own Son, was the same, yet not the same as the Jesus whom Paul may have seen in His earthly life. He was the Son of God then ; but the undeclared Son of God ; it was the Resurrection that constituted the starting point in His new career as Redeemer of the world. On that day by Damascus Paul felt within himself the pulsing of a new life ; and a voice which he felt he could neither misunderstand nor misinterpret told him that that new life was nothing else than the Living Christ living in him. In that one moment he learnt the meaning of the earthly life of Jesus the Christ, the meaning of His death, the meaning of His Resurrection, the meaning of Christ indwelling as the Power for holiness. In this revelation of the Living Christ within him, he became conscious that he had

PAUL'S CONCEPT

come under the control of a life-giving spirit—the Lord is the Spirit—he had passed from death to life. He had passed from death to life ; he had died, he must have died with Christ to the evil which formerly had dominion over him ; he felt that that was dead ; he had been raised, raised with Him into the new life in which he was now living. It all centred in his consciousness of the real death of sin and to sin, in himself and of himself ; his consciousness of the new life for good pulsing within. He is one with Christ, for Christ is one with him. Christ by dying and rising again for him has effected his salvation, and what Christ has done for him Christ can and is ready to do for all. That is Paul's gospel ; is there any wonder that he was an enthusiast ? If only the experiences were more common, there would be more enthusiasts now.

We must emphasise this last point in his spiritual experience ; his consciousness of the new Power that had come into his life. The sense of the forgiveness of sin had made the death of Christ as the secret of that forgiveness one of his great realities ; the sense of the experience of the present Christ in glory on the Damascus road had convinced him of the reality of the Resurrection ; the abiding sense of power over evil had convinced him of the constant real spiritual presence of the Master in his own life, of the spiritual union between Christ and His people. The Christ who died, the Christ who

JESUS AND PAUL

rose again, the Christ who ever liveth, the Power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; this is the Christ of Paul's spiritual experience. What was the Christ who had wrought such wonderful experience?

Not by any means merely the Jewish Messiah. It might have been thought superfluous to have even stated the fact; but the development especially by Schweitzer of the "apocalyptic" interpretation of the New Testament makes it needful to insist that this view will not fit all the facts. We cannot of course go in detail into the Master's own conception of His Person or His work, but the passage (Matt. xi. 27-30; Luke x. 22) which is admitted almost unanimously to belong to the earliest tradition effectually disposes of all attempts to limit His thoughts either of Himself or His mission to the function of a herald of the impending end of the world and the guardian of the faithful Jewish remnant; or to interpret His teaching as being merely "interimsethik." Certainly such an interpretation will not fill Paul's conception; Jesus is the Christ, but something far more than merely the Jewish Messiah, whether nationalistic or apocalyptic.

The Lord.—The first and most frequently recurring addition to the simple expression Jesus-Christ or Christ Jesus is "the Lord," and in this Paul is in full accord with the other Apostles and the whole of the primitive Church.²⁷¹ "This title," says

PAUL'S CONCEPT

Bacon,²⁷² "embodied the distinctive element of the Christian faith. He refers specially to 1 Cor. xvi. 22; xii. 3; Rom. x. 9; and Philip. ii. 11, showing that the solemn confession of all believers was summed up in these words "Jesus is Lord," and suggesting that such a confession now might well unite the severed ranks of Christendom to-day.²⁷³ What did Paul and the other early Christians mean by it? Deissmann²⁷⁴ suggests that in view of the widespread use of this title as applied to the Roman Emperor, Christians who heard Paul preach in the style of Philip. ii. 9, 11, and 1 Cor. viii. 6, must have found in the solemn confession that Jesus Christ is "the Lord" a silent protest against other "lords" and especially the tendency to deify men like Nero or Domitian, but this was not all. In the LXX. the word is used to translate Adonai, Elohim, Jahveh and Jah; and Edghill²⁷⁵ (referring to its use for Jahveh) says "it was thus by the fearless application to Christ, of Old Testament passages referring to the Lord, that the Apostles first approached and sought to solve the problem of our Lord's divinity." J. Weiss²⁷⁶ expresses the same fact in a different way. "In the expression 'our Lord Jesus Christ' the whole primitive Christian religion is contained in germ. Everything that man can feel toward God comes in this name to utterance. This is the beginning of the Christ-belief, the Christ-religion. The moment at which the first Christian sent up his

JESUS AND PAUL

prayer to the exalted Christ, is the birth-hour of that religion which to many Christians up to the present time appears to be the only true Christianity, alone entitled to the name."

The meaning of this is that Jesus the exalted Christ has, for Christians, the value of God and that means that to them He is God. Bruce²⁷⁷ indeed seems to suggest that this title, Lord, refers specially if not only to His function as Him who died for our sins, "the title, Lord, as applied to Jesus as Paul uses it, means the one who by His death has earned the place of sovereign in my heart," but the general view is rather that it denotes Him as exalted and glorified, worthy not merely of service and reverence, but such worship as we should offer only to God; it was an expression of their recognition of the something more in Him which marked Him off from other men. It was not, as it has sometimes been expressed, a deification of Jesus by the disciples; it was their acknowledgment of what they found in Him, that while He was man, He was also God.

As to the sense in which Paul regarded Him as God there is considerable difference of opinion. With the possible exception of Titus ii., 13, there is only one passage in his writings (Rom. ix. 5), in which Christ is actually described by him as God, and the interpretation of this passage has been a matter of great controversy; some attaching the predicate to Christ, some to the Father.

PAUL'S CONCEPT

In view of the uncertainty we agree with Dr. Newport White's comment,²⁷⁸ "the proofs that Paul held Christ to be God Incarnate do not lie in a few disputable texts, but in the whole attitude of his soul toward Christ and in the doctrine of the relation of Christ to mankind which is set forth in his Epistles." This has to be borne in mind when considering, *e.g.*, such comments as that of Beyschlag.²⁷⁹ "The Lordship in the sense in which Paul ascribes it to the exalted Christ is indeed something incomparable, quite superhuman as contrasted with any one other essential quality of humanity; but not *θεότης* in the strict sense of the word, for that would be His own from eternity."

The Pre-Existence.—This brings us to the great question of the Pre-existence; one of the most fundamental, if also one of the most difficult questions in connection with Paul's conception of the Lord. Paul does not indeed in any way argue about the matter; he takes it practically always for granted,²⁸⁰ and Professor Mackintosh²⁸¹ is probably right when he says "the idea of Christ's pre-existence when it becomes explicit in the Christian mind does so by way of inferential interpretation. It is less a conscious element in the faith which apprehends salvation in Jesus than a conception of reflective thought. Were He but one more man in the world it would not have occurred to the New Testament writers, it would not occur to any one

JESUS AND PAUL

now, to affirm that prior to His earthly life He had lived elsewhere ; but if we place Him on the side of Divine reality, the thought of His eternal being will be apt to follow of itself." It was the facts of his spiritual experience which demanded the something more in Christ when compared with other men that led Paul to assert without any attempt to argue the point that Christ's existence had not begun with His human birth. That he may have come across the idea in the current Palestinian theology²⁸² is quite likely ; but that does not destroy its value ; he took it over as the thought which would alone explain the facts he had to explain, and it becomes one of the fundamental presuppositions in his conception of Jesus the Christ, none the less true because others have known and used it before. The passages in which he refers to it²⁸³ are more numerous than we might perhaps be at first inclined to suspect ; and the Christ who is brought before us in them is viewed by the Apostle in very different lights. The Apostle, like all men of truly great genius, saw truth from many different sides, and was not always concerned about harmonising them when they might seem to be at variance. He knew they were all true, all aspects of the one truth ; the truth that influenced his life on so many different sides. Each different aspect in which he represented it was associated for him with some special event that made that for him at the time the truth of greatest import, and

PAUL'S CONCEPT

none would probably have been more astonished than he, had he been able to foresee the infinite amount of controversy that has since taken place over the endeavours to harmonise these different aspects which never to him suggested discrepancy, because they had all come out of the one spiritual experience.

The Son.—Starting as before with the first of his letters, the first aspect of Christ which needs this fact of the pre-existence as an underlying basis is that of the Divine sonship, “God sent forth His Son.” To Paul as to the rest of the primitive Church, Jesus the Christ was God’s Son; what did he mean by it? Schmidt²⁸⁴ says there seems little evidence of the use of the words “Son of God” as a title for the Messiah, but Sanday²⁸⁵ tells us “the most advanced science of our time is by degrees giving back a full equivalent for the old naïve conception that would make such passages as Psalms 2 and 89 predictions of the Messiah.” As to its use in other parts of the New Testament, while the expression *πᾱς θεοῦ* so characteristic of the Acts cannot probably be fairly rendered “Son of God,” the whole attitude of the primitive Christians toward Christ shows that they were practically at one on this point. As Beyschlag²⁸⁶ says, “Had Paul set up a Christology entirely different from the simple synoptic and primitive apostolic Christology, there would have been such a revolution of ideas in primitive Christianity that the contradiction

JESUS AND PAUL

could not have failed to appear ; but we have not the least trace of a Christological controversy in the Apostolic age." This conclusion is confirmed by the universality of the practice of prayer *to* Jesus and *through* Jesus. Loofs²⁸⁷ who has gone very thoroughly into this matter says, "this custom shows clearly as a basis of Christological speculation that Christ to the Christians of that time belonged to the sphere of God. This is the original datum of Christological dogma."

Weizsäcker²⁸⁸ indeed tells us that even the designation, "Son of God" does not take us beyond the conception that He was man ; and Wendt, in regard to its use by the Master, says,²⁸⁹ "It would be wrong to suppose that by this self-designation as the Son of God, Jesus sought only to assert His Messianic vocation ; primarily he wished by this title to indicate His quite peculiarly close and pure fellowship with God." There is a sense, of course, in which all men are or can be sons of God ; but we are not called upon to be for God that which Christ²⁹⁰ was. God sent forth His Son that we should receive the adoption of sons ; but our life will be derived, mediated through His unique life, and the colloquial use of the same term "sonship" to denote the differing relations must not lead us to identify the two. The expressions Paul uses more than once "His own Son," "the Son of His love," point to a something more which marks him off from all others. Professor Bacon in his elaborate mono-

PAUL'S CONCEPT

graph, "*Jesus the Son of God*" argues for the view that the primitive Christian conception of Christ's sonship was merely ethical not essential, but we cannot feel that he has made out his case. There is indeed a sense in which the ethical sonship implies the something more, and viewed in that light we readily grant that the sonship ascribed to Christ is ethical;²⁹¹ but it is not merely ethical. We may not be able to explain it; Paul certainly did not, but he knew it; knew that to him it would have seemed blasphemy to have spoken of himself and Christ as sons of God in the same sense; that there was something in the relationship of this "Son" to God which had never been known before—a fact which alone could explain the great work of salvation—the further interpretation of the word was rendered necessary by the facts which called for explanation;²⁹² we understand the Person of Christ in the light of His work. He is God's "own" Son because He has done work which no other has done or could do.

This criterion will help us to estimate the value of other elaborate speculations which have been pursued in regard to the nature of the Sonship. Take, *e.g.*, the view of Pfeiderer²⁹³ who interprets the expression in 2 Cor. iii. 17, "the Lord is the spirit" thus, "his Lordship depends on His being spirit which is also the very essence of His sonship." This he derives from Rom. i. 3, 4, which he explains in this way²⁹⁴: "the expression

JESUS AND PAUL

'according to the spirit of holiness' is purposely chosen; 'according to the spirit' by itself only forms the opposition to 'according to the flesh' as (anthropologically) indicating the immaterial inner side of the personality, opposed to the material outward side of the body; but the addition of the qualitative genitive 'of holiness' shows that the spiritual inner side of this personality has a spiritual nature specifically distinct from ordinary human nature, viz., a holy nature in no degree influenced by the sinful principle of the flesh, and that it is just this metaphysical reality that forms the essential ground of the divine sonship." Probably no one would have been more astonished than Paul to learn of such an interpretation of his words; an interpretation which rests upon a quasi identification of the spiritual and the material and an endeavour to define the essence, a thing which Paul certainly carefully avoided. Still more probably would he have been astonished at the following words of his interpreter, "If we consider this (*i.e.*, this quasi-physical basis of the sonship) carefully we shall find that it involves a quite essential difference between the definition of Paul and that of the early Christians. According to the latter, the anointing with the Holy Spirit was communicated to the Son of David by baptism, as a specific endowment of his Messianic office with divine strength; according to Paul the spirit of holiness is the principle which forms the

PAUL'S CONCEPT

person, consequently the very essence of the personality of the Messiah." We venture to think that neither Paul nor the primitive Christians would have seen this minute difference, nor troubled about it if they had, and that they would not have held, if they had understood, the semi-physical view of the essence of the sonship which Pfleiderer propounds.

A very similar criticism has to be made about Weizsäcker's view, only he finds the basis of his interpretation in the passage in 1 Cor. xv., on the heavenly man. After saying very justly that Paul cannot have thought of Christ as an angel or intermediary being or inferior God, he adds,²⁹⁵ "we must have rested content with the explanation that he regarded this heavenly Christ and Lord as unique in His nature, and so a mystery of the faith had he not given us a distinct key to the difficulty. The solution lies in the fact that he does not think of him as man after the fashion and order of the human race, but rather as man in the sense of a higher supernatural world. In contrast with Adam and all his descendants, He is the second Man, the Man from heaven and celestial in His nature. As such He is in complete possession of the Divine Spirit; nay it is possible to call Him absolutely the Spirit. But it is on the lines of a man with a spiritual body that He is conceived, and with an intelligence that thinks wholly in the Divine Spirit."

Harnack, who makes this one of the bases of

JESUS AND PAUL

his famous distinction between the adoptianist and pneumatic Christologies, seems to hold the same view,²⁹⁶ and the position seems to have won considerable acceptance, in our judgment without due warrant.²⁹⁷ In this passage the Apostle has been discussing the theme of the Resurrection and in connection therewith the resurrection body, and there suddenly comes to his mind a quotation²⁹⁸ from a work he had studied in his pre-Christian days "the first Adam was made a living soul : the last Adam was made a life-giving spirit," which seems to throw a flood of light on the problem he had been considering, of the sureness of the resurrection. Our resurrection depends on the resurrection of Christ. Christ has been raised from the dead ; what was the nature of His risen body ? Surely a heavenly spiritual body partaking in some way of the spiritual and itself the source of spiritual influence for the resurrection of others. If with the best MSS. we omit²⁹⁹ the words " the Lord " from verse 47, and read " the first man is of the earth, earthy : the second man is from heaven," the whole basis for the elaborate speculations of modern theology on the nature of the Heavenly Man as a synonym for Christ seems to fade away ; it is a disquisition on the nature of the resurrection body ; not on pre-existent Christology at all. We need to hear in mind the caution of Bishop Robertson,³⁰⁰ " There is far too great a tendency to forget that the primitive Church was nothing

PAUL'S CONCEPT

so little as a society of theologians. Monotheists and worshippers of Christ by the same instinct, to analyse their faith as an intellectual problem was far from their thoughts." So also the great Christological utterances of the Apostle were not formal theological pronouncements; rather almost *obiter dicta*, declarations suggested by and arising out of the special circumstances of himself and those to whom he was writing; and not therefore to be scrutinised with the idea of finding the absolute logical or theological accuracy that we should expect in formal treatises.³⁰¹

But the very fact that He is a Son implies what is known as the subordination which is so characteristic of some of Paul's letters specially those to the Corinthians.³⁰² These passages³⁰³ are quite unequivocal in their teaching; whatever is to be understood from other phrases as to identity of nature between the Father and the Son, there is no question that the Apostle declares that in his judgment God's own Son as Son was subject to the Father. But is there anything in that to cause alarm? Is it not rather a reasonable and necessary way of viewing the facts?

That the Apostle does not attempt to harmonize statements which have since been held to be conflicting was probably due to the fact that he himself was not conscious of any such conflict. Jesus was God's own Son—the Son of His love—but the very fact of Sonship implies subordina-

JESUS AND PAUL

tion ; he sees no difficulty for the simple reason that there is none ; the difficulty is one created by subsequent interpreters which does not concern us and need not trouble us, as it certainly did not trouble him.

Was the sonship ideal or real ? There is an interesting if not very profitable speculation fathered by Beyschlag³⁰⁴ that Christ pre-existed ideally, *i.e.*, in the mind of God, in accordance with a theory of Jewish theology akin to the Platonic doctrine of ideas ; but inasmuch as Beyschlag himself abandoned³⁰⁵ the view and explained the Apostle's statements about the personal being of Christ in a pre-incarnate condition as an imperfect mode of setting forth the truth that the temporal appearance of Christ must be traced back to an Eternal Basis, and as few if any others seem disposed to take up the speculation we may very well pass it by. We need hardly say that this speculation has nothing to do with the truth emphasised by Beyschlag himself as well as by many others, that Jesus as man is God's ideal man,³⁰⁶ man as God meant him to be. Not however as some suggest,³⁰⁷ an ideal which never had actual historical existence, a position which is a development of that of Kant,³⁰⁸ that Christ is merely the personification of the Idea, the highest ideal that humanity could frame, and which, though he criticised it, was practically adopted in his earlier days by D. F. Strauss.³⁰⁹ To many this position seems not

PAUL'S CONCEPT

only untenable but astounding. There is a whole world of difference between personification of thought and living personality. A universal truth cannot constitute personality, though it may find manifestation therein, but the living force of personality is needed to make the idea operative in other lives. We have no hesitation, although we admit there is much controversy on the matter in taking our stand with those ³¹⁰ who think that history can only be rightly interpreted in the light of great personalities, not merely of great ideas.

Coming now to the other passages dealing with the pre-existence of Christ it is true that the occasion of several of the most important of these is ethical, not theological ; but this while true does not rob them of their theological value or importance. The Apostle was not intending to make theological pronouncements, but he has done so, and their theological value is perhaps even thereby enhanced, because they give us what was evidently his habitual way of looking at the themes he here deals with. To him the pre-existence of Christ with its correlative of Kenosis, as explaining who He was, and how He came to be what He is, are fundamental truths, so familiar that he can with unstudied grace quietly use them for practical purposes without thinking of offering any proof. " Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ that though He was rich yet for your sakes He became poor, that ye through His

JESUS AND PAUL

poverty might be rich." When we ask to what the being rich refers the only possible answer³¹¹ seems to be that the Apostle had in his mind a state of existence prior to His earthly life. This agrees with the earlier testimony of Gal. iv., 4, "God sent forth His Son." When we put the two together we seem shut up to the conclusion that Paul believed Jesus to have been in some way God's Son, and as that Son to have existed with Him before time was, and then in the fulness of the Divine purpose to have come from that Divine state to an earthly existence, which compared with His previous state was as poverty compared with riches. We are not concerned here with the way in which this was brought about, nor with the interpretations which theologians of later days have put upon his statements; we are seeking to get at the Apostle's own conceptions, and here we have it clear that he did believe in what is called the Incarnation of God's Son in the man Jesus, and that this Incarnation implied a Divine pre-existence and a kenosis;³¹² relinquishment and self-renunciation with its correlative of a higher state previously.

In the letters of the Captivity the subject of the pre-existence comes into still greater prominence. In the letter to the Colossians we have the great passage i., 15-21, with its parallel in Eph. i., 10 *sqq.*, which J. Weiss ingeniously describes as a kind of dogmatic hymn, and in which we have certainly evidence of Paul's acquaintance with

PAUL'S CONCEPT

the philosophical learning of his time. Most of those who have dealt with it agree³¹³ that although he does not mention the word Logos, a very thorough knowledge of the Alexandrian logos doctrine underlies the wording of the passage. Many of the terms he uses are to be found in Philo, others in the Stoic philosophy ; and although it is scarcely likely that he had come across either Philo or his works ; his studies in Tarsus would, as we saw above, have given him some acquaintance with the system of thought and the terminology of Alexandria as well as that of the Stoa. But his use of elements derived from these sources does not any more than in the case of the Palestinian doctrine of the pre-existence detract either from his own originality or from the value of his conception of the Christ. In his reflection over the great fact of the union of Divinity and humanity in the Person he knows as the Lord Jesus Christ, he finds that other thinkers of earlier days, both Jewish and others have been led to discoveries on certain points which he recognises as true and harmonising with the great thought which will alone explain for him the work the Redeemer has already accomplished and has yet to complete ; and so with the true originality of spiritual genius he takes up and incorporates these earlier discoveries into the conception which explains the facts of his spiritual experience. The suggestion has indeed been made that the passage

JESUS AND PAUL

is inspired by Gnostic speculation, but it is certainly true that if there be, as there seems to be, reference to Gnosticism, it is by way of recoil, not of imitation ; ³¹⁴ and though in view of this fact the Epistle wears a more definitely apologetic character than some of the others, the Apostle never loses sight of the practical side ; he does not bring in theology for its scholastic interest, but for the practical value which healthful views will have over life.

The chief aspects under which the Christ is presented to us here are, the Son of His love ; the image of the invisible God ; the first-born of all creation and yet the divine agent in creation ; the Head of the Church ; the expression of the divine fulness ; and the Reconciler of all things. That this passage in its entirety presents a view of Christ which has not hitherto been given by the Apostle will be readily admitted, but that does not necessarily imply any inconsistency between this and the views in earlier letters, but simply that the Apostle has had under the pressure of new experiences to unfold implications that had so far lain dormant ; the cosmical Christology is a natural evolution of what had been reached before. The Sonship here predicated of Christ is what we have spoken of above as ethical in the admissible sense of the term. Christ is the Son of His love ; love is the essential characteristic of God ; and in the Son we learn as otherwise we could not, what God is. God is love and the

PAUL'S CONCEPT

love of Christ is so wonderful that we cannot think of Him as less than Divine. The same line of thought underlies the expression "the image of the invisible God." God in His essential Being is invisible, but Christ expresses Him ; as he says further on : " In Him dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." There is such a likeness between Christ and the Father that Christ can represent the Father fairly and fully. The Apostle was not, we imagine, thinking here of anything metaphysical, but setting forth a religious truth. Christ is the Son because He is the perfect embodiment, the complete revelation, not of the essence but of the character of God. Only in the exalted Christ, perfected and glorified do we behold the very image of God, the perfect expression, in a form apprehensible by our faculties, of the Divine nature which would otherwise have remained hidden from us. This thought sends the Apostle back to the question of the origin of this likeness, and it is better frankly to admit that had we to depend on this passage alone it would be difficult to avoid the conclusion that Paul looked on the Divine and Pre-existent Christ who became Incarnate, as Himself a created being. The phrase "first born of all creation" puts Him in the ranks of the created, even though he follows this up by the declaration, by Him were all things created and He is before all things and in Him all things hold together. That this limited view does not, however, express

JESUS AND PAUL

the full conception of the Apostle is certain, not merely from other passages which go beyond it, but also from consideration of the connexion between His Person and His work ; but as far as this passage itself is concerned, no other conclusion is possible.

The Recapitulation.—The remainder, commencing with the expression, “ the head of the body ” carries us forward to the remarkable conception in the letter to the Ephesians (which was probably written about the same time) of the recapitulation, the gathering together of all things in Him. What he had in his mind was the fact of the dislocation in the world that had been caused by sin ; this will be remedied by the work of Christ who as the Divine Spirit brings a new principle of life into the midst of humanity, working in them to produce a new body, a redeemed humanity, His Church, of which He is the Head, and which will in the end include all who live in Him and through Him, and as the evil will have been eliminated, will sum up all things. There are of course elements in this conception which are even now difficult of comprehension, but it does seem as if the Apostle had here anticipated the working out of the great discovery of recent days, the principle of evolution ; at any rate the principle of evolution throws some light on his thought. Dr. Illingworth³¹⁵ has finely said, “ Our Lord Jesus Christ stands forth as the head and summary of that material creation through

PAUL'S CONCEPT

whose gradual development He had all along been preparing for Himself a body—man made at last in the image of God. He stands forth as the final utterance of those eternal verities which philosophy had all along been struggling to express. He stands forth as the goal in which all human progress finds its possibility, its meaning and its end; the way, the truth, and the life. He is immanent in all creation; but none the less He is its creator and as such not only through all, but above all, God for ever." Dr. Walker³¹⁶ has expressed the same thought in other words: "In looking to Christ therefore, we are by no means looking to an ordinary man, or to a man apart from the God in Him, or to one who stood on the same level as we ourselves stand on, but to one in whom that life of the Spirit, towards which God was raising man all throughout His previous working in the world, reached the culmination and realised its end, in whom on the one hand the fulness of man's life as a son of God entered the world, and on the other hand the Spirit of God completely expressed itself in human form and which as a Divine-human Personality must abide for ever. What we have in Christ is the culmination of God's creation as well as Redemption. In Him the Thought, the Word, the Spirit, the Life of God in man is realised, and that Power of God enters the world which can lift man out of "the flesh" into the full life of the "Spirit."

JESUS AND PAUL

We come finally to the declaration in the last of Paul's letters from his prison at Rome, Philip. ii., 5-11, which forms a fitting climax to all that has gone before, and which is often regarded as the high water-mark of Paul's Christology. Of course this very fact has caused it to be scrutinised with extraordinary minuteness : there is probably no passage in the Apostle's writings about which the storm of controversy has raged more fiercely or about which even now there is greater divergence of opinion. The suggestion of Baur³¹⁷ that the whole passage is a rehash of Gnostic speculations would scarcely be worth noticing, so utterly is it now discredited, were it not that Pfleiderer³¹⁸ seems to have come to the same conclusion in regard to verse 6. The suggestion however need not really trouble us, since Pfleiderer who, unlike Baur, regards the letter as written by Paul, has in regard to this verse to have recourse to the last despairing refuge of the critic who finds any reasonable view in hopeless discord with his own special scheme of interpretation, the hypothesis of interpolation ; but in this he stands practically alone. Gifford, who has discussed the passage with exceptional fulness,³¹⁹ translates verse 6 as follows, " Who though he was subsisting in the essential form of God, yet did not regard His being on an equality of glory and majesty with God as a prize and treasure to be held fast, but emptied Himself thereof." There are several points in this

PAUL'S CONCEPT

interpretation which are distinctly at variance with the interpretations which had previously been most generally accepted, but we are inclined on the whole to think that he has probably come nearest to the true meaning. The remainder of the passage does not present such great difficulties, and he well points out that the word "form" in verse 7 must have there the same meaning as in verse 6, and that if the form of God be the essential nature of God, the form of man must be the essential nature of man, and this guards against the Docetic interpretation both of this and the following phrase "being made in the likeness of men." So also the expression "being found in fashion as a man," he renders "in the whole mode and fashion of His life, in every sensible proof whereby a man is known and recognised as man, Christ was so recognised and known and found as man" and this as well as the whole spirit of the passage utterly excludes Docetism. On the whole we are, however, inclined to think that Dr. Gifford is too insistent on an absolutely defined meaning for every word and every phrase, and the result at which he arrives is a little too close to the classical phraseology of the Creeds to allow us to think that Paul had such intensely dogmatic thoughts in his mind. It has to be borne in mind that the purpose of the passage was distinctly ethical, and so long as he was able to emphasise the fact that Christ had descended

JESUS AND PAUL

from a pre-existent state of glory to a state of human poverty and then on account of His infinite self-sacrifice had been exalted to great glory in His Risen life, we need scarcely think that the Apostle intended to deal with such matters as metaphysical essence either of Divinity or humanity.

One of Dr. Gifford's subsidiary observations is of great value in view of the immense controversy that has arisen around the doctrines of "the two natures, and the two states," when he says "as to the manner in which these two natures are united in one Person, or as to the degree in which the Deity was limited or the Humanity exalted by their union, during Christ's life on earth, the Apostle has said nothing in this passage."³²⁰ We would add nor anywhere else, and it would probably have been much to the advantage of the Saviour's work in the world, if less time and strength had been devoted to these problems; but as he does not mention them we are not concerned with them here. Of course many will entirely differ from Gifford when he rules out the whole doctrine of Kenosis; but we are strongly inclined to agree with him, and to think that all the wealth of meaning that has been found in or put into the word "emptied" is a case of misapplied ingenuity. A doctrine of Kenosis may be a necessary inference from certain other accepted positions in regard to the Person and work of Christ, but to get it all out of the one

PAUL'S CONCEPT

word ἐκένωσε is probably putting into the word a great deal that was never in the Apostle's mind when he used it. The truth is that neither the explanation of His pre-existence, nor the way in which the Divine and the human were combined in Christ were for Paul fundamental matters ; it was the living, present Christ, God and man, though he could not explain how, who was to him the great reality, and the relation to whom constituted the great problem for all men. Paul could say without the slightest hesitation, " I know in whom I have believed and am persuaded that He is able to keep that which I have committed to Him against the day ; " and while he endeavoured by all means in his power to make his belief intelligible to himself and to others, he never concealed his conviction that this was not a matter for the intellect alone, and that consequently problems might arise with which the man who relied simply on the intellect would be unable to deal. To him the Christ was a living present reality, " Christ liveth in me," and knowing Him thus, no amount of logical antinomies in the doctrine of His Person would shake his faith. The Son of God had loved him, given Himself for him ; and he would gladly devote himself, body, soul and spirit to His service ; Apostle, servant, slave of the Lord Jesus Christ.

CHAPTER VI

THE RELATION BETWEEN JESUS AND PAUL

HOW then, to come to our closing section, are we to estimate the relationship between them? Has the Apostle altered primitive Christianity? Was he the second founder of Christianity? Was he the inventor of Christianity as it exists to-day? Ever since the days of Bolingbroke³²¹ at least, the suggestion has found supporters that the true founder of Christianity, at any rate as it has been generally accepted, was Paul and not Jesus Christ, and he has been described, sometimes to his credit, sometimes to his discredit, as the founder or at least the second founder of Christianity.

What then was the Master's own conception of Himself and His gospel? What was the primitive Apostles' conception of Jesus and His Gospel? What was Paul's conception of Jesus and the Gospel? and, what if there be any difference between them was the relation between these different conceptions? Of course we have already incidentally touched on all of these points, but it will be necessary to gather them all together and supplement what we have already said in order to formulate an answer to the

THEIR RELATIONS

questions with which we have opened this section.

What was the Master's own conception of Himself? The subject of the self-consciousness of Jesus is one which has received an immense amount of attention in recent years; but it cannot be said that anything like general agreement has yet been reached. Gardner³²² has attempted to sum up the variety of opinions thus: "Some think that Jesus claimed only a Messianic sonship. Some regard Him as claiming an ethical relationship to God of a sublime and unique character. Others venture into metaphysics, and found upon the words of Jesus some kind of doctrine of the Trinity." There is however a stage of opinion³²³ which lies prior to all these, that "Jesus did not care what men believed about him personally; he never considered himself and made no claims for personal recognition; his whole soul was bound up in the coming of the kingdom of God, and he had no thought for anything else." It will probably be quite sufficient answer to this to quote the author of "Ecce Homo":³²⁴ "let us pause once more to consider that which remains throughout a subject of ever-recurring astonishment, the unbounded personal pretensions which Christ advances. Christ's discovery is Himself. To humanity struggling with its passions and its destiny he says, Cling to Me, cling ever closer to Me. We cannot deny that He commanded men

JESUS AND PAUL

to leave everything and attach themselves to Him; that He declared Himself King, Master and Judge of men; that He promised to give rest to all the weary and heavy laden."

It has indeed been said that such claims are inconsistent with a meek and lowly spirit, and Bruce³²⁵ rightly says that the reconciliation of Christ's Messianic consciousness with His humility is of greater importance than has been generally recognised. He points out, however, that such a reconciliation is by no means impossible and specially as we look at the Messiahship on the side of duty rather than of dignity; that it is among the truly greatest that the truest lowliness is found; that this is the very truth involved in the Incarnation; God humbling Himself to bear and share the miseries of His children.

We can certainly say that Jesus made very remarkable claims. His constant use of the title "Son of man," which (though even this has been ardently denied),³²⁶ is too well supported to need demonstration here, has implications which carry us a good way. His designation of Himself as Judge at the end of the world, although this also has, of course, been denied,³²⁷ has been very generally accepted and has been held³²⁸ to imply infinite knowledge; that He who makes such a transcendent claim is in effect claiming to be God; and it is indeed simply on the ground that the claim involves so much that its use has, *e.g.*, by Bousset³²⁹ been denied. He says it is "in-

THEIR RELATIONS

conceivable " that Jesus should have made such a claim ; but the criterion of the inconceivable is about the most useless that we know.

Further we venture, in spite of the criticism³³⁰ of some able writers, to think that Jesus claimed to be the Messiah and in support of this assertion we readily acknowledge the value of the careful investigations of Schweitzer, although we can by no means accept all his conclusions as to the character of the Master's Messianic consciousness and especially that it simply meant that He by the sacrifice of Himself was to usher in the last times ; that His death was forced on by " dogmatic eschatological necessity ; " ³³¹ nor that of J. Weiss³³² and others, that the Messianic conception of Jesus related simply to the future. Of course we have to remember that the decision as to the nature of the Master's consciousness depends on the view taken of the value of the records ; how far we have the original tradition, and how far that tradition has been coloured by the dogmatic prepossessions of their authors ; but we may fairly gather from the records as we have them, that there was the expectation of a Messiah and that Jesus claimed³³³ to fulfil that expectation, and in a larger sense than most people had any thought of. As to the time when this Messianic consciousness arose in Him, and the further question as to the time when He made it known, we see no reason for putting aside the view that has been very generally accepted, that al-

JESUS AND PAUL

though there may have been some development³³⁴ in it during His career, the consciousness became clear to Jesus at the time of His baptism, but that He kept it locked up in His own mind until³³⁵ the occasion of the conversation with the disciples at Caesarea Philippi, unless with Schweitzer³³⁶ the Transfiguration be placed before that event ; and that this reticence was due to His conviction of the difference³³⁷ between His own and the popular conception, and the natural fear lest a premature disclosure should be misunderstood and misused by the people and even by His own followers. But beside the specific Messianic consciousness, the Master's consciousness involved the conception of a unique relation between Himself and God which is only properly expressed by "sonship" ; a sonship which no others could claim for themselves ; as Fairbairn³³⁸ puts it, "the constitutive element in the consciousness of Jesus was the filial ; round it His thought and character as it were, crystallized. He directly and intuitively knew His own Sonship, and by its means He made known God's Fatherhood."

Here then we have the main elements in the consciousness of Jesus about Himself, and we need have no hesitation in asserting that in them we have at any rate the basis on which Paul's interpretation was built up and out of which it naturally grew.

How then about the conception formed by the other Apostles, and its relation to that of Paul ?

THEIR RELATIONS

The general relation of Paul to the other Apostles has been one of the most hotly debated questions of modern times ; but in regard to this special point there is fairly general agreement that Paul and the other Apostles were practically at one. Whatever differences there may have been between them on other points, there seems to have been none here. It is probably true indeed, that the primitive disciples contented themselves with the demonstration of the proposition, "Jesus is the Messiah," and that it scarcely seems to have occurred to them to ask at first what this Messiahship involved ; and that only as they began to realise that His work was more than merely Messianic did they find themselves faced by questions as to the constitution of His Person. Professor Bacon,³³⁹ who points out that Paul never uses the Synoptic title "Son of man," which he regards as specially characteristic of what he calls the Matthaean tradition, lays great stress on the employment of the title "Jesus is Lord" as embodying at least for the Pauline churches the distinctive element of the Christian's faith, and then adds³⁴⁰ that the same Christology is characteristic also of the Petrine portion of the Acts ; "the author grounds the church's faith upon the same confessional basis and by appeal to the same scripture," in other words, the Christology of Paul and of the primitive Apostles as represented in the Acts is in essence one and the same.³⁴¹ All that was essential in

JESUS AND PAUL

the Pauline conception was contained in the conception of the primitive Christians; the impression His personality had made upon them was reproduced in the convictions of Paul.

There remains the question of Christianity, the religion of Jesus as it comes to us from Him and His followers: are there differences here that would justify the contention that Paul has altered Christianity; that he, not Jesus, was the true founder of Christianity?

It has sometimes been said that the Apostles including Paul altered Christianity from the religion *of* Jesus to a religion *about* Jesus; but this rests upon a misconception of the religion of Jesus Himself, and of what He taught His disciples. Jesus Himself never exhibited any consciousness of sin; we never hear of any prayer for pardon from His lips; His relation to His Father is one of filial dependence, but at the same time of perfect confidence; there is a conception of His relationship to the Father underlying His approach to Him not by any means the same as that which is natural to men in general. He had His own personal religion, but we cannot adopt it simply for ourselves; our approximation to it can only be gained through Him. The opening message of His preaching was "Repent," turn from sin; that is the first step toward entrance into the kingdom; but He never suggests that His own entrance has been gained in that way. The next step is childlike

THEIR RELATIONS

trust ; faith in the Divine tenderness and compassion ; and the Apostolic interpretation of His life and work is that they reveal and make clear that grace and mercy. "Come unto Me," says He, "all that are burdened and heavy laden, and I will give you rest ;" and the interpretation of that message in the earliest times, as ever since, has been that through Him we are brought close up to God, and that is just Paul's belief. Even the doctrine of the saving value of His death which has been so often regarded as a serious excrescence on the Master's teaching finds its roots in His own expression, "the Son of Man came to give His life a ransom for many."³⁴² It is simply trifling with the deepest needs of humanity to say, as *e.g.*, Weinel³⁴³ does, "Jesus was an artist ; a poet of such force and greatness that His words are imperishably printed on the soul of every one who has become acquainted with them ; but we must not exaggerate, and we must leave him his own peculiar work, which was to give humanity a new ideal and a new belief in God, the purest ideal and the loftiest belief ; His gospel is the full accomplishment of moral religion." Such a conception of the work of Jesus the Christ is in our judgment lacking in its most essential features. The same criticism is applicable to the stress that is often laid on the fact that Jesus was a Jew, as if He were a Jew and nothing more. It is just as if we were to attempt to explain Shakespeare by saying that

JESUS AND PAUL

he was an Englishman ; or Napoleon that he was a Corsican ; the statements are true, but not by any means the whole truth. The same criticism applies to another point on which there has been much discussion ; the universalism of Paul as contrasted with the supposed narrow ideas of Jesus and the primitive Apostles. However true this idea may be in reference to the primitive Apostles, and there is even in their case more to be said on the other side than is sometimes allowed ; it is quite untrue as applied to Jesus. The truth is that in this as in other points, " it is Paul who has understood Jesus best ; " ³⁴⁴ and the universalism which Paul so wonderfully emphasised came to him from his conception of what Jesus was and desired. The same observation will apply to their teaching in the sphere of Ethics. It has often been remarked, as we saw above, that Paul quotes very few of the sayings of Jesus, though more than some suggest ; but far more important than verbal identities or even similarities or coincidences is the similarity of spirit ; the Christian life as Paul depicts it, is instinct with the spirit of the ethical teaching of Jesus. ³⁴⁵ As to God's method of dealing with sin, it has been suggested that Jesus knows only of full and free forgiveness on the Father's part while Paul interposes a great barrier of sacrifice and mediation. In considering that suggestion we have to remember that we are here discussing only Paul's own views as expressed in his letters,

THEIR RELATIONS

not the inferences which have been drawn by others. A great deal of what is objectionable in theories of the atonement is simply the product of makers of creeds and theological systems, and for that Paul must not be held responsible. We have just seen that Jesus Himself said that He gave His life a ransom for many, and if we may accept John as in this case embodying an early tradition, He also said, "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so shall the Son of Man be lifted up."³⁴⁶ The constant references in the primitive preaching given in the Acts of the Apostles, and the reference to this point which Paul makes in the summary of what he had "received;"³⁴⁷ show the impression which the teaching of the Master on this point had made on the earliest disciples; that in some way His death and forgiveness were connected. A tradition so early and so constant may fairly be held to rest on a sure foundation, and we may take it that this was not only an element in the earliest Christianity, but that it took its rise from hints given by the Master Himself. And when we have said that we have said enough, for if we make allowance for the way in which the Apostle as a Jew expressed the truth in forms that would meet the difficulties and requirements of people who had been brought up in the sacrificial systems of the religions current in his day; and just limit ourselves to the bedrock truth which he found certified by his own spiritual experience "Christ

JESUS AND PAUL

died for me, therefore I know I am forgiven," we have nothing that hinders, only something that explains. The forgiveness of sins is God's free act ; but how do I know that God loves me so much as freely to forgive me ? The answer³⁴⁸ is " God commendeth His love toward us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us ; He that spared not His own Son, but freely delivered Him up for us all, shall He not with Him freely give us all things ? " The death of Jesus the Christ is the outward and visible manifestation of the inward grace, the grace of our Father ; we know the length and breadth and depth and height of the love of God in the sacrifice of Calvary ; it is just the manifestation of His perfect love ; and in that sense it redeems. Does Paul go further than that ? We think not, and if not there can surely be no ground for the contention that Paul has in this matter altered Christianity either that of Jesus or that of the primitive Apostles. The perversions and excrescences of later days we have nothing to do with here ; by all means let them go ; the value of Paul will only shine out more clearly. So with his teaching about salvation by faith ; there is here no conflict, no inconsistency. The great message of the Master was, trust God ; the great message of the Apostle was, trust God ; what difference there may be is a difference not of essence, but of accent. So with the very word " Gospel " there is little doubt that when he

THEIR RELATIONS

spoke as he so often did of the good tidings that he had in his mind the very passage³⁴⁹ with which the Master began His public ministry.

We can find no ground either in Paul or the primitive Apostles or the Master Himself to support the contention of Wrede³⁵⁰ that Paul was the true or even the second founder of Christianity, rather do we find ourselves in agreement with Harnack³⁵¹ when he says, "Those who blame him for corrupting the Christian religion have never felt a single breath of his spirit, and judge him only by externals, clothes or book-learning; those who extol or criticise him as a founder of religion are forced to make him bear witness against himself on the main point and acknowledge that the consciousness which bore him up was illusory and self-deceptive. As we cannot want to be wiser than history which knows him only as Christ's missionary, and as his own words clearly attest what his aims were and what he was, we regard him as Christ's disciple, as the apostle who not only worked harder, but accomplished more than all the rest put together."

There has been far too great a tendency to seek for and lay stress upon points of difference rather than points of likeness. In the desire to find the essence of Paulinism the Pauline accentuation has been emphasised and deepened until there has been real danger of losing touch with the original thought of the Master, but this

JESUS AND PAUL

has been the fault of his successors, not of the Apostle himself, whose constant motto was, "Not I, but Christ ;" and the corrective of that tendency is to get back to Paul ; he will lead us back to Christ, and Christ will lead us back to God.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

Where the titles of works are omitted or curtailed, the full title will be found under the Author's name in the Bibliography, where also will be found the abbreviations or signs adopted to distinguish the different works of any author, of whose works more than one is used.

Page	2, Note	1.—Schweitzer, <i>von R.</i> , p. 13.
"	3, "	2.—cf. Häckel, <i>The Riddle</i> , chap. XVII.
"	4, "	3.—cf. Sadler, p. 56; K. C. Anderson, <i>Hibbert</i> , No. 34, pp. 345 sqq.; Gardner, <i>Expl.</i> , p. 170; Schweitzer, <i>von R.</i> , p. 396. contra, Fairbairn, p. 294; Seaver, p. 80; Lester, p. 412. also Reich, pp. 66 sqq.
"	4, "	4.—Knowling, <i>Witness</i> , pp. 170, 173, 175, 211, 216; <i>Testimony</i> , pp. 157, 170.
"	4, "	5.—Shaw, pp. 364, 368, 483.
"	4, "	6.—J. Smith, <i>The Integrity, etc.</i> , pp. 124, 133, 140, 185; Reich, pp. 51, 64 sq.
"	4, "	7.—Conybeare, <i>passim</i> .
"	5, "	8.—R. Scott, p. 30; cf. Du Bose, <i>Gospels</i> , p. 9.
"	5, "	9.—cf. Ramsay, <i>Exp.</i> , 6, vi., p. 177; and Balfour, <i>Defence</i> , pp. 7 sqq., on "Ultimate Beliefs." This is the defect that vitiates Prof. Schäfer's brilliant Brit. Assoc. address on "Life."
"	6, "	10.—cf. Feuerbach in Pfeleiderer, <i>Development</i> , p. 135; and Robertson, <i>Pagan Christs</i> , p. 263.
"	6, "	11.—Häckel, <i>Riddle</i> , p. 119.
"	6, "	12.—Runze, <i>P.R.E3.</i> , xxiv., p. 177 sq.
"	7, "	13.—Drews, <i>Christ-Myth</i> , p. 299.

REFERENCES

- | | | | |
|------|----|------|--|
| Page | 7, | Note | 14.—Drews, <i>Christ-Myth</i> , p. 298. |
| | " | " | 15.—cf. Mackintosh, pp. 261 sqq. |
| | " | " | 16.—Weinel, <i>Jesus</i> , p. 168. |
| | " | " | 17.—Pfleiderer, <i>Development</i> , p. 135. |
| | " | " | 18.—cf. Lodge, <i>Life</i> , p. 112 ; <i>Man</i> , p. 70. |
| | " | " | 19.—Mackintosh, p. 262. |
| | " | " | 20.—Wendland, p. 34 ; cf. Lodge, <i>Man</i> , pp. 27, 62 ; Smith, <i>Integrity, etc.</i> , p. 170 ; Seaver, p. 15. |
| | " | " | 21.—Streeter, <i>Foundations</i> , pp. 137 sqq. |
| | " | " | 22.—cf. Bailey, <i>Poets, etc.</i> , "The conception of a finite machine-made world is giving way to that of an organic vital process moving under the control of laws which are themselves vital, organic, progressive." cf. also Underhill, pp. 3 sqq. ; Mercer, p. 133. |
| | " | " | 23.—D'Arcy, p. 151. |
| | " | " | 24.—Herman, <i>Eucken, etc.</i> , p. 154. |
| | " | " | 25.—Thompson, <i>Miracles</i> , pp. 211 sqq. |
| | " | " | 26.— <i>ibid</i> , p. 212. |
| | " | " | 27.—Thompson, <i>Thro facts, etc.</i> , p. 104. |
| | " | " | 28.—Bousset, <i>Jesus</i> , p. 91 ; cf. Gilbert, p. 152 ; Schmiedel, <i>Hibb. Supp.</i> , p. 76 ; <i>Jesus, etc.</i> , p. 85 ; Wernle, <i>Quellen</i> , p. 32. |
| | " | " | 29.—Mark x., 18. |
| | " | " | 30.—Schmiedel, <i>E. Bi.</i> , col., 1873, sqq. |
| | " | " | 31.—Neumann, <i>Jesus</i> (preface), p. xiv. |
| | " | " | 32.—Robertson, <i>Pagan Christs</i> , pp. 233 sqq. |
| | " | " | 33.—Smith, W. B., pp. 177 sqq. |
| | " | " | 34.—Schmiedel, <i>E. Bi.</i> , col., 1872. |
| | " | " | 35.— <i>Fundamentals</i> , vol. vii., p. 50. |
| | " | " | 36.—2 Peter i., 21. |
| | " | " | 37.—cf. Myers, <i>Human Personality</i> , vol. i., pp. 12, 17, 73 ; James, <i>Varieties</i> , p. 483. |
| | " | " | 38.—Gardner, <i>Hibbert</i> , No. 35, p. 496. |
| | " | " | 39.—cf. Allen, <i>Contentio Veritatis</i> , p. 236. |
| | " | " | 40.—Sanday, <i>Christologies, etc.</i> , pp. 100 sqq. cf. Weinel, <i>Ist das, etc.</i> , pp. 10, 22 sqq. |
| | " | " | 41.—But cf. van Manen, <i>E. Bi.</i> , col. 3473. |
| | " | " | 42.—J. Weiss, <i>Jesus, etc.</i> , p. 86. |
| | " | " | 43.—Tacitus, <i>Annals</i> , xv., 44. |
| | " | " | 44.—Smith, W. B., p., 238. |

REFERENCES

-
- | | | | |
|------|-----|------|--|
| Page | 26, | Note | 45.—Drews, <i>The Witnesses, etc.</i> , p. 46. |
| ,, | 26, | ,, | 46.—Smith, W. B., p. 239; J. Weiss, <i>Jesus, etc.</i> , p. 86; Case, p. 247. |
| ,, | 27, | ,, | 47.—Conybeare, p. 161; cf. also Remsburg, pp. 40 sqq.; van Eysinga, pp. 10 sqq.; Whittaker, pp. 22 sqq.; Bousset, <i>Was wissen Wir?</i> p. 16; von Soden, <i>Hat Jesus, etc.</i> , pp. 11 sqq.; J. Weiss, <i>Jesus, etc.</i> , pp. 86 sqq.; Carpenter, <i>The First, etc.</i> , p. 340; Rossington, pp. 74 sqq.; Clodd, p. 70; Case, pp. 246 sqq.; Thorburn pp., 114 sqq. |
| ,, | 27, | ,, | 48.—Suetonius, <i>Claudius</i> , chap. xxv. |
| ,, | 27, | ,, | 49.—Josephus, <i>Ant.</i> , xviii., 3, 3. |
| ,, | 27, | ,, | 50.—Schürer, H. J. P., I., ii., pp. 143 sqq. |
| ,, | 28, | ,, | 51.— <i>Ibid.</i> , p. 149. |
| ,, | 28, | ,, | 52.—J. Weiss, <i>Jesus, etc.</i> , p. 89 note. |
| ,, | 28, | ,, | 53.—Burkitt, p. 325. Harnack has also written recently to the same effect. |
| ,, | 28, | ,, | 54.—Josephus, <i>Ant.</i> , xx., 9, 1. |
| ,, | 28, | ,, | 55.—Schürer, <i>H.J.P.</i> I., ii., p. 186. |
| ,, | 28, | ,, | 56.—J. Weiss, <i>Jesus, etc.</i> , p. 89 note. |
| ,, | 28, | ,, | 57.—Drews, <i>The Witnesses, etc.</i> , p. 6. |
| ,, | 29, | ,, | 58.—cf. Weinle, <i>Ist das, etc.</i> , p. 107; <i>Jesus, etc.</i> , p. 56; Jülicher, <i>Hat Jesus, etc.</i> , p. 19; von Soden, <i>Hat Jesus, etc.</i> , p. 13; Case, pp. 261 sqq.; J. Weiss, <i>Jesus, etc.</i> , pp. 89 sqq. |
| ,, | 29, | ,, | 59.—cf. Carpenter, <i>The First, etc.</i> , pp. 344 sqq.; Thorburn, pp. 132 sqq. |
| ,, | 29, | ,, | 60.—cf. Case, p. 267. |
| ,, | 29, | ,, | 61.—cf. Wernle, <i>die Quellen</i> , p. 6; Salmon, <i>Intro.</i> , p. 108. |
| ,, | 30, | ,, | 62.—cf. Burkitt, p. 326; D. Smith, pp. 25 sqq.; Tasker, <i>D.B.</i> , vol. v., p. 421; Waitz, <i>P.R.E3.</i> , xxiii., pp. 79 sqq.; Clodd, p. 65; Westcott, <i>Intro.</i> , pp., 462 sqq.; Moggridge, <i>Exp.</i> , I., xii., pp., 325 sqq. |
| ,, | 30, | ,, | 63.—cf. Ropes, <i>D.B.</i> , vol. v., pp. 343 sqq.; Hennecke, <i>P.R.E3.</i> , xxiii., pp. 18 sqq.; Knowling, <i>Witness, etc.</i> , pp. 105 sqq. |
| ,, | 30, | ,, | 64.—cf. Schweitzer, <i>von R.</i> , p. 6; Bruce, <i>Kingdom</i> , pp. 341 sqq. |

REFERENCES

-
- Page 31, Note 65.—J. Weiss, *Jesus, etc.*, p. 93; cf. also Burkitt, pp. 217, 325, 331; Walker, *Christ*, p. 62; Renan, *Jesus*, p. 1; Bruce, *Apol.*, p. 346; Nolloth, p. 19; Arnold, *Literature*, p. 154; Pfeiderer, *Phil.*, II., p. 124; Salmon, *Gospels*, p. 274; Carpenter, *The Historical Jesus*, p. 36; J. Weiss, *Christus*, p. 74; Streeter, *Foundations*, p. 83; Warfield, p. 145; Case, pp. 136, 221; Ottley, p. 65.
- „ 32, „ 66.—cf. van Manen, *Exp. Times*, vol. ix., pp. 205, 257, 314 sqq.; *E.Bi.*, col. 3621 sqq.; Knowling, *Witness, etc.*, pp. 140 sqq.; *Testimony, etc.*, pp. 8, 53, etc.; Shaw, pp. 64 sqq.; Schweitzer, *Paul*, pp. 121 sqq.
- „ 33, „ 67.—Including Kalthoff, cf. *The Rise, etc.*, pp. 142 sqq.
- „ 33, „ 68.—cf. Drews, *Witnesses*, p. 103; van Manen, *E.Bi.*, col. 3624.
- „ 33, „ 69.—van Manen, *Exp. Times*, vol. ix., p. 206.
- „ 33, „ 70.—cf. Jülicher, *Intro.*, pp. 28 sqq.; Wrede, *Paulus*, p. 3; Warfield, p. 237 note; Robertson, *D.B.*, I., 484; von Soden, *Early, etc.*, pp. 116 sqq.; Shaw, p. 84; Bacon, *Intro.*, p. 21; Moffatt, *Intro.*, pp. 113, 142; Gardner, *H. V.*, p. 209; Bousset, *Was wissen wir, etc.*, pp. 18 sqq.
- „ 33, „ 71.—Harnack, *History*, vol. i., p. 52 note.
- „ 33, „ 72.—Drews, *Myth*, p. 166; *Witnesses*, pp. 63, 119.
- „ 33, „ 73.—cf. Kähler, *P.R.E3.*, iv., p. 17; Gardner, *R.E.P.*, pp. 1, 4; Moffatt, *Intro.*, p. 63; Bacon, *Intro.*, p. 17; Bousset, *Was wissen wir, etc.*, p. 20.
- „ 33, „ 74.—Wrede, *Paulus*, p. 2. He rejects 2 Thess., Ephes. and the Pastorals.
- „ 33, „ 75.—B. Weiss, I., pp. 281 sqq.
- „ 33, „ 76.—Beyschlag, II., pp. 3 sqq.
- „ 33, „ 77.—Bacon, *Intro.*, p. 56.

REFERENCES

Page	33,	Note	78.—Moffatt, <i>Intro.</i> , p. 64 ; <i>E. Bi.</i> , col. 5095.
"	33,	"	79.—Jülicher, <i>Intro.</i> , p. 54.
"	33,	"	80.—Vischer, <i>passim</i> .
"	33,	"	81.—Deissmann, <i>St. Paul</i> , p. 15.
"	33,	"	82.—McGiffert, pp. 383, 393, 405.
"	33,	"	83.—Sabatier, pp. 106, 225, 229 sqq.
"	33,	"	84.—Ropes, pp. 115, 119, 120.
"	33,	"	85.—cf. Findlay, <i>D. B.</i> , III., p. 714 ; Lock, <i>D. B.</i> , IV., p. 773 ; Newport White, <i>E. G. T.</i> , IV., p. 57 ; Durell, p. xi. ; Shaw, p. 444 ; Knowling, <i>Testimony</i> , pp. 121 sqq. ; Bartlet, p. 512 ; Ramsay, <i>C. R. E.</i> , p. 248.
"	34,	"	86.—For the N. Galatian theory, Schmiedel, <i>E. Bi.</i> , col. 1592 sqq. ; for the S., cf. Ramsay, <i>D. B.</i> , II., pp. 81 sqq. ; and for the relevant literature these and Moffatt, <i>Intro.</i> , pp. 90 sqq.
"	34,	"	87.—Rendall, <i>E. G. T.</i> , III., p. 147.
"	34,	"	88.—Bacon, <i>Intro.</i> , p. 57 ; McGiffert, pp. 229 sqq. ; Zahn, quoted by Dewick p. 291 note ; Garvie, pp. 23 sqq.
"	35,	"	89.— <i>Philippians</i> , pp. 30 sqq.
"	35,	"	90.—cf. Salmond, <i>E. G. T.</i> , III., p. 405.
"	35,	"	91.—cf. Jülicher, <i>Intro.</i> , p. 122.
"	35,	"	92.—Bacon, <i>Intro.</i> , p. 124.
"	35,	"	93.—cf. Bartlet, p. 180, and R. Scott, p. 352, who assigns them to Luke.
"	35,	"	94.—cf. <i>infra.</i> , p. 66.
"	36,	"	95.—cf. Ropes, p. 31 ; Ramsay, <i>Paul, etc.</i> , pp. 4 sqq. ; Harnack, <i>Luke</i> , p. vi.
"	36,	"	96.—Jülicher, <i>Intro.</i> , p. 445 ; Schmiedel, <i>E. Bi.</i> , col. 37 ; McGiffert, p. 238.
"	36,	"	97.—cf. Harnack, <i>Luke, etc.</i> ; <i>The Acts, etc.</i> , <i>passim</i> ; Renan, <i>Apostles</i> , p. 18 ; Knowling, <i>E. G. T.</i> , II., p. 3 ; Burkitt, p. 115 ; Moffatt, <i>Intro.</i> , p. 295.
"	37,	"	98.—For its contents cf. Wernle, <i>die Quellen</i> , p. 48 ; von Soden, <i>Early, etc.</i> , pp. 129 sqq., and for other attempts, the list in Moffatt, <i>Intro.</i> , pp. 197 sqq.
"	37,	"	99.—Harnack, <i>Date, etc.</i> , p. 125 note.

REFERENCES

-
- | | | | |
|------|-----|------|---|
| Page | 38, | Note | 100.—Harnack, <i>Date, etc.</i> , p. 138. |
| " | 38, | " | 101.—Allen, <i>Contentio Veritatis</i> , p. 212 ;
cf., Bacon, <i>The Making, etc.</i> ,
p. 172 ; van Eysinga, p. 49. |
| " | 39, | " | 102.—Quoted by Harnack, <i>Date, etc.</i> , p. 136. |
| " | 39, | " | 103.—J. Weiss, <i>Jesus, etc.</i> , p. 154. |
| " | 39, | " | 104.—cf. Moffatt, <i>Intro.</i> , pp. 227 sqq. |
| " | 39, | " | 105.—cf. Bacon, <i>Intro.</i> , p. 210 ; Moffatt,
<i>Intro.</i> , p. 227. |
| " | 39, | " | 106.—cf. J. Weiss, <i>Paul, etc.</i> , p. 9 ; Menzies,
p. 39 ; Wernle, <i>die Quellen</i> , pp.
56 sqq. ; Lacey, p. 61 ; Moffatt,
<i>Theology, etc.</i> , p. 22. |
| " | 40, | " | 107.—Menzies, p. 36 ; cf. Thompson,
<i>Mark</i> , p. 15. |
| " | 40, | " | 108.—cf. Worsley, p. 22. |
| " | 40, | " | 109.—Harnack, <i>Date, etc.</i> , p. 124. |
| " | 40, | " | 110.—Burkitt, pp. 120 sqq. ; Bacon, <i>Making,</i>
<i>etc.</i> , p. 174 ; Lester, p. 10. |
| " | 41, | " | 111.—Harnack, <i>Date, etc.</i> , 114 note ; Moffatt,
<i>H. N. T.</i> , p. 271 note ; Bebb, <i>D. B.</i> ,
III., p. 168 ; contra, Schmiedel,
<i>E. Bi.</i> , col. 49, 5050 sqq. |
| " | 41, | " | 112.—cf. Gore, <i>Dissertations</i> , p. 15 ; Thomp-
son, <i>Mark</i> , p. 215 ; Knowling,
<i>Testimony</i> , p. 152 ; Findlay,
<i>D. B.</i> , III., p. 702. |
| " | 41, | " | 113.—Gardner, <i>Expl.</i> , p. 306., cf. Thomp-
son, <i>Miracles</i> , p. 94 ; Harnack,
<i>Luke</i> , p. 112. |
| " | 41, | " | 114.—Carpenter, <i>The First, etc.</i> , p. 256. |
| " | 42, | " | 115.—cf. Bruce, <i>Kingdom</i> , p. 13 ; Burkitt,
p. 198. |
| " | 42, | " | 116.—cf. Pfeleiderer, <i>Phil.</i> , II., p. 35 ;
Harnack, <i>Luke</i> , p. 169 ; Wernle,
<i>Quellen</i> , p. 75 ; von Soden, <i>Early,</i>
<i>etc.</i> , p. 198 ; Drews, <i>Myth</i> , p. 220 ;
Bacon, <i>Making</i> , p. 146. |
| " | 42, | " | 117.—cf. Schmiedel, <i>E. Bi.</i> , col. 1876 ;
Gilbert, p. 32 ; Lester, p. 400 ;
Arnold, p. 153 ; McGiffert, p. 61 ;
contra, Simpson, pp. 268 sqq. ;
Warfield, p. 156 ; Knowling,
<i>Messianic</i> , pp. 64 sqq. |
| " | 42, | " | 118.—cf. von Soden, <i>Early, etc.</i> , pp. 182
sqq. ; Bacon, <i>Intro.</i> , p. 198. |

REFERENCES

-
- Page 42, Note 119.—Allen, *Contentio Veritatis*, p. 219.
 „ 43, „ 120.—Lester, p. 7, suggests 150 A.D.;
 Schmiedel, *E. Bi.*, col. 2551,
 suggests 140.
 „ 43, „ 121.—cf. Renan, *Jesus*, appendix; Bey-
 schlag, *N.T.Th.*, I., 217; Ram-
 say, *First*, p. 88; Gore, *Bampton*,
 p. 68; Salmon, *Intro.*, pp. 192
 sqq.; Westcott, *Intro.*, p. 254;
 Durell, pp. 77, 193; Bartlet, p.
 325; Knowling, *Messianic*, p.
 61.
 „ 44, „ 122.—Weizsäcker, II., p. 235; Harnack,
Christianity, p. 19; von Soden,
Early, etc., p. 439; E. F. Scott,
 p. 376; Bacon, *Intro.*, p. 259;
 Moffatt, *H.N.T.*, p. 497.
 „ 44, „ 123.—Wendt, *St. John* (see specially sum-
 mary), p. 256.
 „ 44, „ 124.—Wernle, *Beginnings*, II., pp. 276 sqq;
 cf. Remsburg, p. 56.
 „ 44, „ 125.—Wild, *Contentio Veritatis*, p. 152;
 cf. McGiffert, p. 616.
 „ 44, „ 126.—Scott, E. F., p. 376.
 „ 45, „ 127.—ut supra, p. 24; cf. Cohu, *St. Paul*,
 p. 213.
 „ 46, „ 128.—Wooding, *Hibbert*, No. 36, p.
 857.
 „ 47, „ 129.—Cheyne, *E.Bi.*, col. 3362.
 „ 47, „ 130.—cf. Jülicher, *Hat Jesus, etc.*, pp. 32
 sqq.; J. Weiss, *Jesus, etc.*, pp.
 52 sqq.; Case, pp. 77 sqq.;
 Carpenter, *Historical Jesus, etc.*,
 pp. 18 sqq.
 „ 47, „ 131.—Smith, W. B., p. 67.
 „ 47, „ 132.—Kalthoff, *passim*. cf. Case, p. 40;
 Weinl, *Jesus, etc.*, p. 73; *Ist*
das, etc., p. 3; Warschauer, pp.
 34 sqq.; Schweitzer, *von R.*,
 pp. 312 sqq.; J. Weiss, *Jesus*,
etc., pp. 9 sqq.; Bousset, *Was*
wissen wir? pp. 12 sqq.
 „ 47, „ 133.—cf. Drews, *Myth*, p. 228.
 „ 47, „ 134.—Kalthoff, p. 127.
 „ 48, „ 135.—cf. Roberts, *Hibbert*, No. 26.
 „ 49, „ 136.—Pfleiderer, *Primitive*, I., p. 96.

REFERENCES

-
- Page 50, Note 137.—cf. Vischer, p. 17; Wernle, *Beginnings*, p. 223; R. Scott, p. 51; Sabatier, pp. 49 sqq.; Wrede, pp. 7, 49; J. Weiss, *Paul*, p. 74; Garvie, pp. 16 sqq.; Alexander, pp. 35 sqq.; Pfeiderer, *Primitive*, I., pp. 65 sqq.; *Phil.*, II., pp. 165 sqq.
- „ 50, „ 138.—Bruce, *Paul, Exp.*, 4, viii., p. 28.
- „ 50, „ 139.—Kennedy, *Last*, pp. 43 sqq.; cf. Deissmann, *St. Paul*, p. 107; Harnack, *History*, I., pp. 89, 94; Drews, *Myth*, p. 177 note; Schweitzer, *Paul*, p. 45.
- „ 50, „ 140.—Drews, *Witnesses*, p. 117; cf. Montefiore, *Judaism and St. Paul*.
- „ 50, „ 141.—Schweitzer, *Paul*, p. 45.
- „ 51, „ 142.—cf. Kölbing, pp. 22 sqq.
- „ 51, „ 143.—Stevens, p. 58.
- „ 51, „ 144.—Specially by Pfeiderer; cf. *Primitive*, vol. I., chap. 3.
- „ 51, „ 145.—Harnack, *History*, I., pp. 54 sqq.; cf. Schweitzer, *Paul*, p. 64.
- „ 52, „ 146.—Alexander, p. 41.
- „ 52, „ 147.—Cohu, *Paul*, p. 159 note; cf. Schweitzer, *Paul*, pp. 69, 80.
- „ 53, „ 148.—cf. J. Weiss, *Jesus, etc.*, p. 126; *Christus, etc.*, p. 48; Alexander, pp. 48 sqq.; Gardner, *R.E.P.*, p. 142.
- „ 53, „ 149.—Lightfoot, *Philippians*, pp. 278 sqq.; Pfeiderer, *Primitive*, I., pp. 42 sqq.
- „ 53, „ 150.—Lightfoot, *Philippians*, pp. 279 sqq.
- „ 53, „ 151.—Alexander, pp. 51 sqq.
- „ 53, „ 152.—cf. Kennedy, *Last*, pp. 347 sqq.
- „ 53, „ 153.—cf. Weinel, *Jesus, etc.*, p. 57; Garvie, p. 10; Schweitzer, *Paul, etc.*, pp. 96 sqq.
- „ 53, „ 154.—Ackermann, pp. 33 sqq.
- „ 53, „ 155.—Adam, *The Religious Teachers of Greece*, pp. 360 sqq.
- „ 54, „ 156.—Jowett, I., p. 367.
- „ 54, „ 157.—cf. Sanday and Headlam, pp. 51 sqq.; Pfeiderer, *Phil.*, II., p. 160; *Primitive*, I., p. 81; Somerville, p. 118; Kennedy, *Last*, pp. 231, 345.

REFERENCES

-
- | | | | |
|------|-----|------|--|
| Page | 54, | Note | 158.—Schweitzer, <i>Paul</i> , pp. 92 sqq. |
| " | 54, | " | 159.—Pfleiderer, <i>Primitive</i> , I., p. 81. |
| " | 54, | " | 160.—Jowett, I., p. 410. |
| " | 54, | " | 161.—Schweitzer, <i>Paul</i> , p. 91 note. |
| " | 54, | " | 162.—J. Weiss, <i>Christus, etc.</i> , p. 40. |
| " | 55, | " | 163.—Sadler, pp. 15, 20; cf. Loisy, <i>Hibbert</i> , No. 37, pp. 51 sqq.; Lester, p. 324; Gardner, <i>R.E.P.</i> , pp. 80, 100, etc. |
| " | 55, | " | 164.—Underhill, p. 203; cf. Rawlinson, <i>Foundations</i> , p. 182; J. Weiss, <i>Jesus, etc.</i> , pp. 28 sqq. |
| " | 55, | " | 165.—Kennedy, <i>Mystery</i> , p. 281, sqq. |
| " | 55, | " | 166.—Ibid., p. 282. |
| " | 55, | " | 167.—Schweitzer, <i>Paul</i> , p. 194. |
| " | 57, | " | 168.—Drews, <i>Witnesses</i> , p. 118; cf. van Eysinga, p. 87. |
| " | 57, | " | 169.—Deissmann, <i>St. Paul</i> , p. 101. |
| " | 58, | " | 170.—Gal., i., 22. |
| " | 59, | " | 171.—1 Cor., ix., 1. |
| " | 59, | " | 172.—2 Cor., v., 16. |
| " | 59, | " | 173.—Bruce, <i>Paul, Exp.</i> , 4., vii., p. 271; cf. Weinel, <i>Paulus</i> , p. 62. |
| " | 60, | " | 174.—Baur, I., p. 280; cf. Drews, <i>Myth</i> , p. 169. |
| " | 60, | " | 175.—2 Cor., xii., 1. |
| " | 60, | " | 176.—J. Weiss, <i>Paul, etc.</i> , pp. 41 sqq.; cf. Rawlinson, <i>Foundations</i> , p. 188; Campbell, J. M., p. 228; Knowling <i>Witness</i> , p. 2 note. |
| " | 61, | " | 177.—cf. Kölbinger, p. 109. |
| " | 61, | " | 178.—Baur, I., p. 272. |
| " | 61, | " | 179.—Sabatier, p. 73; cf. Moffatt, <i>Paulinism</i> , p. 19; Somerville, p. 266. |
| " | 61, | " | 180.—Jowett, I., p. 13. |
| " | 61, | " | 181.—cf. Weizsäcker, I., p. 142; Loisy, <i>Hibbert</i> , No. 37, p. 60; Drews, <i>Myth</i> , p. 170; Martineau, p. 396. |
| " | 62, | " | 182.—cf. van Eysinga, p. 93; Drews, <i>Myth</i> , p. 170; Gardner, <i>R.E.P.</i> , p. 200; Martineau, p. 379; Bacon, <i>Jesus, etc.</i> , p. 99; Deissmann, <i>Paul</i> , p. 123; Moffatt, <i>Paulinism</i> , p. 18; Jülicher, <i>Intro.</i> , p. 35; Campbell, J. M., p. 227. |
| " | 62, | " | 183.—B. Weiss, <i>Bibl. Theol.</i> , I., p. 277. |

REFERENCES

- Page 62, Note 184.—Swete, *Asc.* p. xii, cf. Bruce, *Paul, Exp.* 4, ix., p. 92; Campbell, R. J., p. 92; Bernard, *E. G. T.*, vol. III., p. 70.
- „ 62, „ 185.—cf. Deissmann, *E. Bi.*, col. 1327; Shaw, p. 7; Wrede, p. 97; Vischer, p. 4; Bartlet, *D. B.*, I., p. 731; Alexander, p. 7; Warschauer, p. 66.
- On the contrary, the Dutch School (cf. van Manen, *E. Bi.*, col. 3626), and supporters (Kalthoff, p. 144; Drews, *Witnesses*, p. 101; Whitaker, p. 164; van Eysinga, p. 109), regard them as formal theological treatises, Epistles in the classical sense.
- „ 63, „ 186.—cf. Deissmann, *Paul*, p. 172 note; Conybeare, p. 42 note, 96 sqq.; Case, p. 193; A. Robertson, *1 Cor.*, p. xxxv.
- „ 64, „ 187.—Comparative summaries of the results are given by Turner, *D. B.*, vol. I., p. 424; Moffatt, *Intro.*, pp. 62 sqq.; A. Robertson, *1 Cor.*, p. xxxiii.; Shaw, p. xi.; cf. also Zahn, *P. R. E3.*, XV., pp. 62 sqq.
- „ 64, „ 188.—cf. Bacon, *Exp.*, 5, vii., pp. 123 sqq.; x., pp. 351 sqq.; 412 sqq.; Ramsay, *Exp.*, 5, iii., pp. 336 sqq.; 6, ii., pp. 88 sqq.; McGiffert, pp. 356 sqq.
- „ 65, „ 189.—cf. Schürer, *H. J. P.*, I., ii., pp. 182 sqq.; Jülicher, *Intro.*, p. 42; Zahn, *P. R. E3.*, xv., p. 67.
- „ 65, „ 190.—Zahn, *P. R. E3.*, xv., p. 68.
- „ 65, „ 191.—But cf. Ramsay, *St. Paul, etc.*, p. 382.
- „ 66, „ 192.—Baur I., pp. 233 sqq.
- „ 66, „ 193.—Jülicher, *Intro.*, p. 192; cf. McGiffert, pp. 417 sqq.; Bacon, *Making, etc.*, p. 84.
- „ 66, „ 194.—Harnack, *Acts*, p. 44; *Date*, p. 103; Godet, *Exp.*, 3, viii., p. 37; Salmon, *Intro.*, pp. 403 sqq.; Newport White, *E. G. T.*, iv., pp. 72 sqq.; Zahn, *P. R. E3.*, xv., p. 86; Ramsay, *St. Paul, etc.*, pp. 308 sqq.; Findlay, *D. B.*, III., p. 714; Deissmann, *Paul*, p. 223; Shaw, p. 446.

REFERENCES

-
- | | | | |
|------|-----|------|--|
| Page | 66, | Note | 195.—Renan, <i>Apostles</i> , p. 78. |
| " | 66, | " | 196.— <i>Gal.</i> , vi., 11. |
| " | 66, | " | 197.—Wrede, p. 17; Knowling, <i>Testimony</i> , p. 197; Weinel, <i>Paulus</i> , p. 71, suggests hysteria; cf. Seligmüller in Ramsay, <i>Teaching of Paul</i> . |
| " | 67, | " | 198.—cf. Deissmann, <i>Paul</i> , pp. 60 sqq.; Cohu, <i>St. Paul</i> , p. 96; McGiffert, p. 116. |
| " | 67, | " | 199.—Weinel, <i>Paulus</i> , p. 6. |
| " | 67, | " | 200.— <i>Ibid.</i> , p. 182; Garvie, p. 78. |
| " | 67, | " | 201.—cf. Jowett, I., p. 300; Gardner, <i>R.E.P.</i> , p. 52; Kennedy, <i>Last</i> , p. 192; J. M. Campbell, p. 163; Wrede, p., 38; Garvie, p. 73; Ropes, p. 125. |
| " | 67, | " | 202.—Wrede, p. 24. |
| " | 67, | " | 203.—Weinel, <i>Paulus</i> , p. 219; cf. p. 286. |
| " | 68, | " | 204.—McGiffert, p. 117. |
| " | 68, | " | 205.—Ramsay, <i>Exp.</i> , 6, vi., p. 81; cf. the fine characterisation in Weinel, <i>Paulus</i> , pp. 280 sqq.; "menschliche Grösse"; Garvie, pp. 69 sqq.; "Paul's Personality" Ropes, p. 135; Deissmann, <i>Paul</i> , p. 77. |
| " | 69, | " | 206.—Deissmann, <i>Paul</i> , p. 82; McGiffert, p. 122. |
| " | 69, | " | 207.—Zahn, <i>P.R.E3.</i> , xv., p. 83; Simpson, p. 194; Kaftan, pp. 38 sqq.; Bruce, <i>Paul</i> , <i>Exp.</i> , 4, vii., p. 118; McGiffert, p. 130; Somerville, pp. 15, 183; Pfeiderer, <i>Paulinism</i> , I., p. 27; contra., Wrede, p. 82. |
| " | 69, | " | 208.—Deissmann, <i>Paul</i> , p. 94. |
| " | 69, | " | 209.—cf. Weinel, <i>Paulus</i> , pp. 103, 109; Campbell, J. M., passim; Matheson, <i>Exp.</i> , 2, i., p. 208; Inge, <i>Exp.</i> , 5, iv., pp. 115 sqq.; Deissmann, <i>Paul</i> , p. 133; Schweitzer, <i>Paul</i> , p. 223; Underhill, pp. 157 sqq.; Dyson, pp. 133 sqq.; Kennedy, <i>Mystery</i> , pp. 284 sqq. |

REFERENCES

- Page 72, Note 210.—cf. von Orelli, *P.R.E3.*, xii., pp. 724 sqq.; Stanton, *D.B.*, III., pp. 352 sqq.; Carpenter, *First*, pp. 60 sqq.; Westcott, *Intro.*, pp. 92 sqq.; Harnack, *History*, I., p. 322; Wendt, *Teaching*, p. 322; Pfeiderer, *E.C.C.*, pp. 21 sqq.; J. Weiss, *Christus*, p. 15; Weinel, *Paulus*, p. 34; Schürer, *H.J.P.*, II., ii., pp. 126 sqq.
- „ 72, „ 211.—Schweitzer, *von R.*, p. 8; cf. Dewick, p. 91.
- „ 73, „ 212.—cf. Charles, *E.Bi.*, col. 1335 sqq.; *D.B.*, I., pp. 741 sqq.; Dewick, *passim*.
- „ 73, „ 213.—Schürer, *H.J.P.*, II., ii., pp. 159 sqq.
- „ 74, „ 214.—Gardner, *R.E.P.*, p. 184.
- „ 77, „ 215.—cf. McGiffert, pp. 121 sqq.; Scott, E.F., *apologetic of the N.T.*, p. 82; Jülicher, *Paulus*, p. 54; Bruce, *Paul, Exp.*, 4, vii., pp. 123 sqq.; For a somewhat different view, Barnard, *Exp.*, 5, ix., p. 318; Beyschlag, II., pp. 11 sqq.; Wernle, *Beginnings*, I., p. 188.
- „ 77, „ 216.—cf. *Hib. Supp.* *passim*; Wrede, p. 86; K. C. Anderson, *Hibbert*, No. 34, p. 354; Harnack, *History*, I., p. 92; Weizsäcker, I., p. 91; contra., Fairbairn, p. 306.
- „ 78, „ 216a.—cf. Sanday, *Christologies, Ancient and Modern*, pp. 121, 132, 166; James, *Varieties*, pp. 233, 242, 483; D'Arcy, *Hibbert*, No. 34, pp. 245, 246; Gardner, *Hibbert*, No. 35, p. 496; Olston, *Mind Power*, p. 19, &c.
- „ 79, „ 217.—cf. Baur, I., p. 66; Pfeiderer, *Phil.*, II., pp. 148 sqq.; Massie, *Exp.*, 3, x., p. 252.
- „ 79, „ 218.—Deissmann, *Paul*, pp. 119 sqq.; cf. Ramsay, *Exp.*, 6, vi., pp. 183 sqq.; and Newport White, *Exp.*, 5, x., p. 72.
- „ 81, „ 219.—Isa., ii., 2.
- „ 81, „ 220.—cf. Weizsäcker, I., p. 89.
- „ 82, „ 221.—Acts, ix., 26.
- „ 82, „ 222.—Gardner, *R.E.P.*, p. 131.

REFERENCES

-
- Page 83, Note 223.—Wernle, *Beginnings*, pp. 225, 253 sqq. ;
Weinel, *Paulus*, p. 223 ; Wrede,
p. 47, interprets the term in a
special way.
- „ 83, „ 224.—cf. Mackintosh, p. 50.
- „ 83, „ 225.—Kaftan, p. 38.
- „ 83, „ 226.—cf. van Manen, *E. Bi.*, col. 3626 ;
Whittaker, p. 105.
- „ 83, „ 227.—cf. C. A. Scott, *Cambridge Biblical
Essays*, p. 353 ; Kaftan, p. 40 ;
Kennedy, *Last*, p. 307 ; Gardner,
H. V., p. 217 ; Sabatier, p. 3 ;
Forsyth, p. 264.
- „ 83, „ 228.—Deissmann, *Paul*, p. 6.
- „ 84, „ 229.—Kaftan, p. 51 ; cf. Weinel, *Paulus*, pp.
255 sqq.
- „ 84, „ 230.—Gardner, *R. E. P.*, p. 226.
- „ 84, „ 231.—Wrede, p. 94.
- „ 84, „ 231a.—Weinel, *Paulus*, pp. 104, 255.
- „ 87, „ 232.—Acts xiii., 16 sqq.
- „ 87, „ 233.—I Cor., xv., 3 sqq.
- „ 87, „ 234.—Garvie, p. 36.
- „ 88, „ 235.—Bruce, *Paul, Exp.*, 4, vii., p. 12 ; Moffatt,
Intro., p. 72.
- „ 89, „ 236.—Jowett, I., p. 3.
- „ 89, „ 237.—Gal. i., 1.
- „ 89, „ 238.—Supra, p. 62.
- „ 89, „ 239.—Gal. i., 17, 18.
- „ 89, „ 240.—Acts ix., 19.
- „ 90, „ 241.—cf. Garvie, p. 121 ; contra, Weinel,
Paulus, p. 246 ; Matheson, *Exp.*,
2, ii., p. 293.
- „ 91, „ 242.—Somerville, p. 264 ; cf. Deissmann,
Paul, p. 171.
- „ 91, „ 243.—cf. Liddon, p. 23 ; Ottley, p. 602 ;
Denney, *Studies*, p. 68 ; Pope,
p. 243 ; Orr, pp. 282 sqq.
- „ 91, „ 244.—Moberly, p. 86 ; Du Bose, *Paul*, p.
295, *Gospels*, pp. 184, 230.
- „ 91, „ 245.—Sanday, *Christologies*, p. 94 ; cf.
Walker, *Spirit*, p. 249 ; Temple,
Foundations, p. 225 ; Forrest, p.
198 ; Mackintosh, p. 386 ; Pfei-
derer, *Paulinism*, I., p. 155 ;
Edwards, *Exp.*, 5, ii., pp. 256 sqq.
- „ 91, „ 246.—Temple, *Foundations*, p. 259.

REFERENCES

- Page 92, Note 247.—cf. Matheson, *Exp.*, 2, i., p. 127; ii., p. 143; Garvie, p. 127; J. Weiss, *Christus*, p. 59; Bruce, *Humiliation*, p. 288; Beyschlag, II., p. 70.
- „ 92, „ 248.—Because it has been called in question, cf. Roberts, *Hibbert*, No. 26, pp. 365 sqq.; Neumann, p. 62; Williams, pp. 51 sqq.
- Contra, Rawlinson, *Foundations*, pp. 153, 368 note; Seaver, p. 202; Pope, p. 266; Grist, p. 64; Forrest, p. 118; Mackintosh, pp. 35 sqq.; Denney, *Studies*, pp. 40 sqq.
- „ 92, „ 249.—B. Weiss, I., p. 104; cf. Knowling, *Testimony*, p. 269.
- „ 92, „ 250.—cf. C. A. Scott, *Cambr. Bibl. Essays*, pp. 331 sqq.; Matheson, *Exp.*, 2, i. and ii. (*The Historical Christ of St. Paul*); Lumby, *Exp.*, i, v. and vi. (*The Gospel in the Epp.*); Knowling, *Testimony*, Lect. x.
- „ 92, „ 251.—Scott, *Cambr. Bibl. Essays*, p. 370.
- „ 93, „ 252.—Thompson, *Miracles*, p. 14.
- „ 95, „ 253.—Supra, p. 76.
- „ 95, „ 254.—J. Weiss, *Jesus, etc.*, p. 30.
- „ 95, „ 255.—Bacon, *Jesus, etc.*, p. 100.
- „ 95, „ 256.—I Cor., xv., 3.
- „ 96, „ 257.—cf. Campbell, *Hibb. Supp.*, p. 185.
- „ 96, „ 258.—cf. Moffatt, *Theology*, p. 142.
- „ 96, „ 259.—cf. Harnack, *Christianity*, pp. 135 sqq.; Pfeiderer, *Phil.*, II., p. 138; McGiffert, p. 57 note.
- „ 96, „ 260.—cf. Wernle, *Beginnings*, I., p. 240; Cohu, *Paul*, p. 124.
- „ 97, „ 261.—cf. Beyschlag, II., p. 161; Weinle, *Paulus*, p. 240; Wernle, *Beginnings*, I., p. 139; Moberly, *Foundations*, p. 272.
- „ 98, „ 262.—cf. Harnack, *Christianity*, p. 160; Deissmann, *Paul*, p. 175; Garvie, p. 109; Forrest, p. 242; B. Weiss, I., p. 436; McComb, *Exp.*, 6, iv., pp. 355 sqq.
- „ 99, „ 263.—Philipp., iii., 21.

REFERENCES

-
- Page 99, Note 264.—Simpson, p. 337.
 „ 99, „ 264a.—Ibid., p. 420.
 „ 100, „ 265.—cf. Simpson, chap. xxv.; Heard, chap. xvi.; Campbell, J.M., p. 104; Watson, *Exp.*, 6, iii., pp. 67 sqq.; Kirsopp Lake, *The Historical Evidence for the Resurrection*, p. 23.
 „ 100, „ 266.—B. Weiss, I., p. 396; cf. Stevens, p. 350.
 „ 100, „ 267.—Pfleiderer, *Paulinism I.*, p. 201.
 „ 100, „ 268.—Schweitzer, *Paul*, p. 162 note.
 „ 100, „ 269.—Lodge, *Man*, p. 293.
 „ 101, „ 270.—Kennedy, *Last*, p. 232; cf. Seaver, p. 144; Nolloth, *Hibbert*, No. 11; A. Roberston, *1 Cor.*, p. 372.
 „ 104, „ 271.—cf. Kennedy, *E.G.T.*, III., p. 438; J. Weiss, *Christus*, p. 24; Orr, p. 258; Somerville, p. 134; Warfield, p. 204; Durell, p. 136, cf. p. 34.
 „ 105, „ 272.—Bacon, *Jesus, etc.*, p. 56; B. Weiss, I., p. 391.
 „ 105, „ 273.—Bacon, *Jesus*, p. 57 note; cf. Denney, *Gospels*, p. 398.
 „ 105, „ 274.—Deissmann, *Light*, p. 359.
 „ 105, „ 275.—Edghill, *Faith*, p. 178 note; cf. Robertson, *Athanasius* (Wace and Schaff), p. xxii.
 „ 105, „ 276.—J. Weiss, *Christus, etc.*, pp. 24, 25.
 „ 106, „ 277.—Bruce, *Apol.*, p. 402.
 „ 107, „ 278.—Newport White, *E.G.T.*, on Titus ii., 13.
 „ 107, „ 279.—Beyschlag, II., p. 73.
 „ 107, „ 280.—cf. J. Weiss, *Christus*, p. 34; Denney, *Studies*, p. 56; Martineau, p. 393; Worsley, p. 346.
 „ 107, „ 281.—Mackintosh, p. 445; cf. Sabatier, p. 334; Forsyth, pp. 261 sqq.
 „ 108, „ 282.—Weizsäcker, I., p. 145; Worsley, p. 346; Mackintosh, p. 449; Denney, *Studies*, p. 52; Garvie, p. 119.
 „ 108, „ 283.—Gal., iv., 4; 1 Thess. i., 9; 1 Cor., viii., 6; x., 4; 2 Cor. viii., 9; Rom., i., 3, 4; viii., 3, 32; Col. i., 15; Eph. i., 3, 4; iii., 9; Philip, ii., 6, 7.
 „ 109, „ 284.—Schmidt, *E.Bi.*, col. 4694.

REFERENCES

- Page 109, Note 285.—Sanday, *D. Bi.*, iv., p. 571; cf. Wendt, *Teaching*, II., pp. 131 sqq.; Warfield, pp. 124, 179; B. Weiss, I., p. 398.
- „ 109, „ 286.—Beyschlag, II., p. 82; cf. Loofs, *P.R.E.* 3, iv., p. 25.
- „ 110, „ 287.—Loofs, *P.R.E.* 3, iv., pp. 21 sqq.; cf. J. Weiss, *Christus*, p. 25; Forsyth (*Faith and Criticism*), pp. 113 sqq.; Walker, *Spirit*, p. 133; Mackintosh, pp. 125, 366; Moffatt, *Exp.* 6, v., p. 316; Home, *Exp.* 2, i., pp. 219 sqq.; Edghill, *Faith*, p. 119, Durell, p. 140. Contra, cf. Gardner, *R.E.P.*, p. 204; Meyer, *Was uns*, etc., p. 44.
- „ 110, „ 288.—Weizsäcker, I., 127.
- „ 110, „ 289.—Wendt, *Teaching*, II., p. 130.
- „ 110, „ 290.—cf. Mackintosh, p. 437; Forsyth (*Faith and Criticism*), p. 115; for a different view, Campbell, R. J., p. 94.
- „ 111, „ 291.—cf. Walker, *Spirit*, pp. 233, 253; Fairbairn, pp. 394, 474.
- „ 111, „ 292.—cf. Kölbing, p. 103; Moffatt, *Theology*, p. 137; Fairbairn, p. 471; Denney, *Studies*, p. 33; Somerville, p. 146.
- „ 111, „ 293.—Pfleiderer, *Paulinism*, I., p. 134; *Phil.*, II., p. 162; cf. Baur, II., p. 247. For Reitzenstein's curious speculation cf. Schweitzer, *Paul*, p. 221.
- „ 111, „ 294.—Pfleiderer, *Paulinism*, I., pp. 126 sqq.
- „ 113, „ 295.—Weizsäcker, I., pp. 144 sqq.
- „ 114, „ 296.—Harnack, *History*, I., p. 327.
- „ 114, „ 297.—cf. Loofs, *P.R.E.* 3, iv., pp. 23 sqq.
- „ 114, „ 298.—cf. J. Weiss, *Christus*, p. 39; Weizsäcker, I., p. 145. The parallelism with Philo is very striking. Kalthoff (p. 97) suggests a Platonic origin, cf. Gardner, *R.E.P.*, p. 197.
- „ 114, „ 299.—cf. B. Weiss, I., p. 410.
- „ 114, „ 300.—A. Robertson, *Athanasius*, p. xxii.
- „ 115, „ 301.—cf. Kennedy, *E.G.T.*, iii., p. 435; Garvie, p. 115; contra, Gifford, *Exp.*, 5, iv., p. 255.

REFERENCES

-
- Page 115, Note 302.—cf. Newport White, *Exp.* 6, ii., pp. 18 sqq.; Kähler, *P.R.E.*3, iv., p. 14; Mackintosh, pp. 71 sqq.
- „ 115, „ 303.—I Cor., iii., 23; viii. 6; xv., 24. cf. also *Eph.* i., 22; iv., 5, 6.
- „ 116, „ 304.—Beyschlag, II., pp. 81 sqq.
- „ 116, „ 305.—cf. Somerville, p. 193.
- „ 116, „ 306.—cf. Beyschlag, II., pp. 65 sqq.; Le Conte, p. 360; Grist, p. 30; Somerville, p. 58; Case, p. 337; Edwards, *Exp.*, 5, ii., p. 186; Griffith Jones, pp. 309 sqq.
- „ 116, „ 307.—cf. Anderson, *Hibbert*, No. 30, pp. 314 sqq.; Drews, *Myth*, p. 19; etc.; van Eysinga, pp. 17 sqq.; Wernle, *Beginnings*, I., p. 251, W. B. Smith, *passim*; Sadler, p. 26. Contra, Ullmann, p. 137; D. Smith, *Exp.*, 6, iv., pp. 214 sqq.; Warschauer, p. 19; Walker, *Christ*, pp. 60 sqq.; Thorburn, pp. 16, 293; E. E. Anderson, *Contemporary Review*, Dec., 1910, p. 673; Case, pp. 322 sqq.
- „ 116, „ 308.—Kant, pp. 72 sqq.; cf. Pfeiderer, *Phil.*, II., p. 164; *E.C.C.*, pp. 163 sqq.
- „ 116, „ 309.—Strauss, III., pp. 437 sqq.
- „ 117, „ 310.—cf. Reich, pp. 70, 185, 192, etc.; Gardner, *H.V.*, p. 13; Macfadyen, pp. 39, 103; Bousset, *Was wissen wir*, pp. 11, 71; Campbell, *Hibb. Supp.*, p. 195; Mackintosh, p. 355; Forsyth, p. 64; Jülicher, *Intro.*, p. 29.
- „ 118, „ 311.—But Baur would not admit this, cf. II., p. 245.
- „ 118, „ 312.—cf. B. Weiss, I., p. 415; Gore, *Bampton*, p. 158; Garvie, p. 119; Bernard, *E.G.T.*, III., p. 87; Matheson, *Exp.*, 2, ii., p. 148.
- „ 119, „ 313.—cf. Lightfoot, *Colossians*, pp. 209 sqq.; Durell, pp. 178 sqq.; J. Weiss, *Christus*, pp. 46 sqq.
- „ 120, „ 314.—cf. Mackintosh, p. 69; Ottley, pp. 107 sqq.

REFERENCES

- | | | |
|-----------|------|--|
| Page 122, | Note | 315.—Illingworth, <i>Exp.</i> , 3, iii., p. 168. |
| " 123, | " | 316.—Walker, <i>Spirit</i> , pp. 167, 244, 339 ;
cf. Forsyth, pp. 321 sqq. |
| " 124, | " | 317.—Baur, II., p. 45. |
| " 124, | " | 318.—Pfleiderer, <i>Primitive</i> , I., pp. 322 sqq. |
| " 124, | " | 319.—See his Exposition of the whole pas-
sage, <i>Exp.</i> , 5, iv., pp. 161 sqq. ;
pp. 241 sqq. |
| " 126, | " | 320.—Gifford, <i>Exp.</i> , 5, iv., p. 262. |
| " 128, | " | 321.—cf. Matheson, <i>Exp.</i> , 2, i., p. 352. |
| " 129, | " | 322.—Gardner, <i>Expl.</i> , p. 191. |
| " 129, | " | 323.—cf. Lester, pp. 214, 288. |
| " 129, | " | 324.—Seeley, p. 166 ; cf. W. B. Smith, p.
226. |
| " 130, | " | 325.—Bruce, <i>Apol.</i> , p. 364 ; <i>Miraculous</i> , p.
256. |
| " 130, | " | 326.—Schmidt, <i>E.Bi.</i> , col. 4722 sqq. ; cf.
Driver, <i>D.B.</i> , iv., pp. 581 sqq. ;
Worsley, pp. 65 sqq. |
| " 130, | " | 327.—Bousset, <i>Jesus</i> , p. 92 ; Wernle,
<i>Quellen</i> , p. 75. |
| " 130, | " | 328.—Durell, p. 208. |
| " 130, | " | 329.—Bousset, <i>Jesus</i> , p. 92. |
| " 131, | " | 330.—cf. Martineau, p. 577 ; Lester, pp. 90,
167 ; Kölbing, p. 47 ; Wrede, see
<i>Schweitzer, von R.</i> , pp. 335 sqq. |
| " 131, | " | 331.—Schweitzer, <i>von R.</i> , p. 389. |
| " 131, | " | 332.—J. Weiss, <i>Christus</i> , p. 14. |
| " 131, | " | 333.—cf. Harnack, <i>History</i> , I., p. 63 note ;
McGiffert, p. 32 ; Bousset, <i>Jesus</i> ,
p. 77. |
| " 132, | " | 334.—cf. Thompson, <i>Mark</i> , p. 235 ; Worsley,
p. 104 ; Harnack, <i>Christianity</i> ,
p. 138 ; Mackintosh, p. 493. |
| " 132, | " | 335.—But cf. Garvie, <i>Exp.</i> , 6, vi., p. 41. |
| " 132, | " | 336.—Schweitzer, <i>von R.</i> , p. 382. |
| " 132, | " | 337.—cf. Bruce, <i>Apol.</i> , p. 362 ; Wernle,
<i>Beginnings</i> , I., p. 48 ; Mackintosh,
p. 17 ; Dewick, p. 163 ; Schweitzer,
<i>Abendmahl</i> , pp. vii. sqq. ; Forrest,
p. 107. |
| " 132, | " | 338.—Fairbairn, p. 368 ; cf. Walker, <i>Spirit</i> ,
p. 246 ; Harnack, <i>Christianity</i> ,
p. 128 ; Moffatt, <i>Theology</i> , pp.
131, 176. |
| " 133, | " | 339.—Bacon, <i>Jesus, etc.</i> , p. 54. |

REFERENCES

- Page 133, Note 340.—Bacon, *Jesus, etc.*, p. 58.
 „ 133, „ 341.—cf. Weizsäcker, I., p. 19; Denney,
 Studies, p. 48; Mackintosh, p. 44;
 Rawlinson (*Foundations*), p. 157.
 „ 135, „ 342.—Mark x., 45.
 „ 135, „ 343.—Weinel, *Hibb. Supp.*, p. 34.
 „ 136, „ 344.—Wernle, *Beginnings*, I., p. 159;
 Harnack, *Christianity*, p. 176.
 „ 136, „ 345.—cf. Alexander, pp. 8 sqq.
 „ 137, „ 346.—John iii., 14.
 „ 137, „ 347.—I Cor., xv., 3.
 „ 138, „ 348.—Rom., v., 8.
 „ 139, „ 349.—Luke iv., 18.
 „ 139, „ 350.—Wrede, p. 104.
 „ 139, „ 351.—Harnack, *Christianity*, p. 176.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

N.B.—Works from this list referred to in the Notes, etc., are generally given under the name of the author only if only one work is given in this list; if more than one is given here, the abbreviation used will be found preceding the title of the work.

Author.	Abbreviation.	Title.	Date.	Place.
Ackermann, C. ..	..	The Christian Element in Plato	1861 ..	Edinburgh.
Alexander, J. A.	—	The Ethics of St. Paul ..	1910 ..	Glasgow.
Andrews, H. T. ..	—	The Value of the Theology of St. Paul for Modern Thought	1914 ..	London.
Arnold, M. ..	—	Literature and Dogma ..	1891 ..	London.
Bacon, B. W. ..	Intro.	.. Introduction to the New Testament	1900 ..	New York.
	Jesus	.. Jesus, the Son of God ..	1911 ..	New Haven.
	Making	.. The Making of the New Testament	1912 ..	London.
Bailey, J. E. ..	—	Poets and Poetry	1911 ..	Oxford.
Balfour, A. J. ..	Defence	.. A Defence of Philosophic Doubt	1879 ..	London.
	Foundations	The Foundations of Belief	1895 ..	London.
Ballard, F. ..	Miracles	.. The Miracles of Unbelief ..	1900 ..	Edinburgh.
	Häckel	.. Häckel's Monism False ..	1905 ..	London.
Bartlet, V. ..	—	The Apostolic Age	— ..	London.
Baur, C. F. ..	—	Paul, His Life and Works (E.T.)	1876 ..	London.
Beyschlag, W. ..	—	New Testament Theology (E.T.) 2	1899 ..	Edinburgh.
Bousset, W. ..	Faith	.. The Faith of a Protestant (E.T.)	1901 ..	London.
	Jesus	.. Jesus	1907 ..	Tubingen.
	Paulus	.. Der Apostel Paulus	1906 ..	Halle.
	Was, etc.	.. Was wissen wir von Jesus	1906 ..	Halle.
Bruce, A. B. ..	Apol.	.. Apologetics	1895 ..	Edinburgh
	Paul	.. St. Paul's Conception of Christianity	— ..	—
	Humiliation	The Humiliation of Christ	1876 ..	Edinburgh.
	Kingdom	The Kingdom of God ..	1890 ..	Edinburgh.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Author.	Abbreviation.	Title.	Date.	Place.
Bruce, A. B.	.. Miraculous	The Miraculous Element in the Gospels	1893 ..	London.
Burkitt, F. C.	.. —	The Gospel History and its Transmission	1906 ..	Edinburgh.
Cambridge Biblical Essays				
	—	Cambridge Biblical Essays	1909 ..	London.
Campbell, J. M.	.. —	Paul the Mystic	1907 ..	London.
Campbell, R. J.	.. —	The New Theology	1907 ..	London.
Carpenter, J. E.	— First	The First Three Gospels	1906 ..	London.
	Jesus	The Historical Jesus and the Theological Christ	1911 ..	London.
Case, S. J.	 —	The Historicity of Jesus	1912 ..	Chicago.
Clodd, E.	 —	Jesus of Nazareth	1905 ..	London.
Cohn, J. R.	.. Gospels	The Gospels and Modern Research	1909 ..	Oxford.
	Paul	St. Paul in the Light of Modern Research	1911 ..	London.
Contentio Veritatis	—	—	1902 ..	London.
Conybeare, F. C.	—	The Historical Christ	1914 ..	London.
Dale, R. W.	.. —	The Living Christ and the four Gospels	1895 ..	London.
D'Arcy, C. F.	.. —	Idealism and Theology	1899 ..	London.
Deissmann, A.	.. Light	Light from the Ancient East	1910 ..	London.
	Paul	St. Paul (E.T.)	1912 ..	London.
Denney, J.	 Jesus	Jesus and the Gospel	1913 ..	London.
	Studies	Studies in Theology	1895 ..	Edinburgh.
Dewick, E. C.	.. —	Primitive Christian Eschatology	1912 ..	Cambridge.
Drews, A.	 Myth	The Christ Myth (E.T.)	1910 ..	London.
	Witnesses	Witnesses to the Historicity of Jesus (E.T.)	1912 ..	London.
Du Bose	 Gospels	The Gospel in the Gospels	1908 ..	London.
	Paul	The Gospel according to Saint Paul	1907 ..	London.
Dupuis	 —	Christianity a Form of the great Solar Myth (E.T.)	— ..	London.
Durell, C. V.	.. —	The Self Revelation of our Lord	1910 ..	Edinburgh.
Dyson, W. H.	.. —	Studies in Christian Mysticism	1913 ..	London.
Edghill, J.	 Faith	Faith and Fact	1910 ..	London.
	Revelation	The Revelation of the Son of God	1911 ..	London.
Egerton, H.	.. —	Liberal Theology and the Ground of Faith	1908 ..	London.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Author.	Abbreviation.	Title.	Date.	Place.
Ellis, P. A. . . .		Modern Views of the Bible	— ..	London.
Eucken, R. . . .	Christians	Can we still be Christians ? (E.T.)	1914 ..	London.
	Life	Life's Basis and Life's Ideal (E.T.)	1912 ..	London.
Everett, C. G. . .	The Gospel of Paul	— ..	1893 ..	London.
Eysinga, G. A. van	—	Radical Views of the New Testament (E.T.)	1912 ..	London.
Fairbairn, A. M.	—	Christ in Modern Theology	1893 ..	London.
(Faith and Criticism)	..	Faith and Criticism	1893 ..	London.
Faut, S. . . .	—	Die Christologie seit Schleiermacher	1907 ..	Tübingen.
Forrest, D. W. . .	—	The Christ of History and the Christ of Experience	1908 ..	Edinburgh.
Forsyth, P. T. . .	—	The Person and Place of Jesus Christ	1909 ..	London.
(Foundations)—				
7 Oxford Men . .	—	Foundations	1912 ..	London.
(Fundamentals) . .	—	The Fundamentals	— ..	Chicago.
Gardner, P. . . .	Expl. . . .	Exploratio Evangelica	1899 ..	London.
	H.V. . . .	A Historic View of the New Testament	1901 ..	London.
	R.E.P. . . .	The Religious Experience of St. Paul	1911 ..	London.
Garvie, A. E. . .	—	Studies of Paul and his Gospel	1899 ..	London.
Gilbert, G. H. . .	—	Jesus	1912 ..	New York.
Gore, C. . . .	Bampton . .	Bampton Lectures	1893 ..	London.
	Dissertations	Dissertations	1895 ..	London.
Green, T. H. . .	—	Prolegomena to Ethics	1884 ..	Oxford.
Griffith-Jones . .	—	The Ascent through Christ	1902 ..	London.
Grist, W. A. . . .	—	The Historic Christ in the Faith of to-day	— ..	London.
Häckel, E. . . .	Riddle . .	The Riddle of the Universe (E.T.)	1911 ..	London.
	Wonders . .	Wonders of Life (E.T.)	1905 ..	London.
Harnack, A. . . .	Acts	The Acts of the Apostles	1909 ..	London.
	Date	The Date of the Acts and the Synoptic Gospels	1911 ..	London.
	Luke	Luke the Physician	1907 ..	London.
	Christianity	What is Christianity ?	1901 ..	London.
	History . .	History of Dogma, vol. I. (all in E.T.)	— ..	London.
Hartmann, F. . .	—	The Life of Jehoshua	1909 ..	London.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Author,	Abbreviation.	Title.	Date.	Place.
Hatch, E.	—	The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church	1890 ..	London.
Headlam and Sanday	—	Romans (I.C.C.).. ..	1895 ..	Edinburgh.
Headlam, A. C. ..	—	St. Paul and Christianity..	1914 ..	London.
Heard, J. B. ..	—	The Tripartite Nature of Man	1868 ..	London.
Hermann, E. ..	—	Eucken and Bergson ..	1912 ..	London.
Herrmann, W. ..	—	The Communion of the Christian with God (E.T.)	1906 ..	London.
Illingworth, J. R.	Personality	Personality, Human and Divine	1896 ..	London.
	Reason ..	Reason and Revelation ..	1902 ..	London.
James, W.	Immortality	Human Immortality ..	1903 ..	London.
	Varieties ..	Varieties of Religious Experience	— ..	London.
Jülicher, A. ..	Intro. ..	An Introduction to the New Testament (E.T.)	1904 ..	London.
	Jesus ..	Hat Jesus gelebt?	1910 ..	Marburg.
	Paulus ..	Paulus and Jesus	1907 ..	Tübingen.
Jowett, B.	—	The Epistles of St. Paul ..	1855 ..	London.
Kaftan, J.	—	Jesus and Paulus	1906 ..	Tübingen.
Kalthoff, A. ..	—	The Rise of Christianity (E.T.)	1907 ..	London.
Kant, I.	—	Religion within the Boundary of Pure Reason (E.T.) ..	1838 ..	Edinburgh.
Kennedy, H. A. A.	Last ..	St. Paul's Conception of the Last Things	1904 ..	London.
	Mystery	St. Paul and the Mystery Religions.. .. .	1913 ..	London.
Knowling, R. J. ..	Messianic ..	Messianic Interpretation ..	1910 ..	London.
	Testimony	The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ	1905 ..	London.
	Witness ..	The Witness of the Epistles	1892 ..	London.
Kölbing, P. ...	—	Die Geistige Einwirkung der Person Jesus auf Paulus	1906 ..	Göttingen.
Lacey, T. A. ..	—	The Historic Christ	1905 ..	London.
Laidlaw, J.	—	The Bible Doctrine of Man	1895 ..	Edinburgh.
Le Conte, J. ...	—	Evolution in its Relation to Religious Thought.. ..	1893 ..	London.
Lester, C. S. ...	—	The Historic Jesus	1912 ..	London.
Liddon, H. P. ..	—	The Divinity of our Lord	1882 ..	London.
Lightfoot, J. B. ..		The Epistles of St. Paul—		
	Col.	Colossians	1875 ..	London.
	Gal.	Galatians	1892 ..	London.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Author.	Abbreviation.	Title.	Date.	Place.
Lightfoot, J. B. ..	Phil. ..	Philippians	1883 ..	London.
Lodge, O. ..	Life ..	Life and Matter	1912 ..	London.
	Man ..	Man and the Universe ..	1908 ..	London.
	Faith ..	The Substance of the Faith	1911 ..	London.
(Lux Mundi) ..		Lux Mundi	1890 ..	London.
Macfadyen, D. ..	—	Truth in Religion	1911 ..	London.
McGiffert, A. C. ..	—	A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age	1897 ..	Edinburgh.
Mackintosh, H. R. ..	—	The Person of Christ ..	1912 ..	Edinburgh.
Martineau, J. ..	—	The Seat of Authority in Religion	1890 ..	London.
Matheson, G. ..	—	Aids to the Study of German Theology	1876 ..	Edinburgh.
Menzies, A. ..	—	The earliest Gospel	1901 ..	London.
Mercer, J. E. ..	—	The Science of Life	1910 ..	London.
Meyer, A. ..	—	Was uns heute Jesus ist ..	1907 ..	Tübingen.
Moberly, R. C. ..	—	Atonement and Personality	1907 ..	London.
Moffatt, J. ..	H.N.T. ..	The Historical New Testa- ment	1901 ..	Edinburgh.
	Intro. ..	Introduction to the Litera- ture of the New Testament	1911 ..	Edinburgh.
	Paul ..	Paul and Paulinism	1910 ..	London.
	Theology ..	The Theology of the New Testament	1912 ..	London.
Montefiore, C. G. ..	—	Judaism and St. Paul ..	1913 ..	London.
Myers, F. W. H. ..	—	Human Personality	1903 ..	London.
Neumann, A. ..	—	Jesus (E.T).	1906 ..	London.
Nolloth, C. F. ..	—	The Person of our Lord ..	1908 ..	London.
Orr, J. ..	—	The Christian View of God and the World	1893 ..	Edinburgh.
Ottley, R. L. ..	—	The Doctrine of the Incar- nation	1908 ..	London.
Pfleiderer, O. ..	Development	The Development of Theo- logy since Kant (E.T.) ..	1890 ..	London.
	E.C.C. ..	The Early Christian con- ception of Christ	1905 ..	London.
	Paul ..	Paulinism (E.T.)	1877 ..	London.
	Phil. ..	The Philosophy and Develop- ment of Religion	1894 ..	London.
	Primitive ..	Primitive Christianity (E.T.)	1906 ..	London.
Pope, W. B. ..	—	The Person of Christ ..	1885 ..	London.
Powell, H. C. ..	—	The Principle of the Incar- nation	1896 ..	London.
Ramsay, W. M. ..	C.R.E. ..	The Church in the Roman Empire before 170 A.D. ..	1894 ..	London.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Author.	Abbreviation.	Title.	Date.	Place.
Ramsay, W. M.	First	The First Christian Century	1911 ..	London.
	Paul	St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen ..	1897 ..	London.
	Teaching ..	The Teaching of St. Paul	1914 ..	London.
Reich, E.	—	The Failure of the Higher Criticism	1905 ..	London.
Remsburg, J. E.	—	The Christ	1909 ..	New York.
Renan, E.	Jesus	The Life of Jesus (E.T.) ..	— ..	London.
	App.	The Apostles (E.T.)	1905 ..	London.
	Paul	Saint Paul (E.T.)	1887 ..	New York.
Robertson, A.	Athan. ..	Athanasias: Select Works and Letters	1892 ..	Oxford.
	1 Cor. ..	Commentary on First Corinthians (I.C.C.) ..	1911 ..	Edinburgh.
Robertson, J. M.	—	Pagan Christs	1911 ..	London.
Ropes, J. H.	—	The Apostolic Age	1906 ..	London.
Rossington, H. J.	—	Did Jesus really live? ..	1911 ..	London.
Sabatier, A.	—	The Apostle Paul (E.T.) ..	1891 ..	New York.
Sadler, G. T.	—	Has Jesus Christ lived on earth?	1914 ..	London.
Salmon, G.	Intro. ..	Introduction to the New Testament	1892 ..	London.
	Gospels ..	The Human Element in the Gospels	1907 ..	London.
Sanday, W.	—	Christologies, Ancient and Modern	1910 ..	London.
Schäfer, F.	—	Life: its Nature, Origin and maintenance	1912 ..	London.
Schmiedel, P. W.	—	Jesus in Modern Criticism	1907 ..	London.
Schürer, E.	H.J.P. ..	The History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ (E.T.) ..	1900 ..	Edinburgh.
Schweitzer, A.	von R. ..	von Reimarus zur Wrede	1906 ..	Tübingen.
	Paul	Paul and his Interpreters (E.T.)	1912 ..	London.
	Abendmahl	das Abendmahl im Zusammen- hang mit dem Leben Jesu, 2tes Heft	1901 ..	Tübingen.
Scott, E. F.	—	The Fourth Gospel	1906 ..	Edinburgh.
Scott, R.	—	The Pauline Epistles	1909 ..	Edinburgh.
Seaver, R. W.	—	To Christ through Criticism	1906 ..	Edinburgh.
Seeley, J. R.	—	Ecce Homo!	1878 ..	London.
Shaw, R. D.	—	The Pauline Epistles	1903 ..	Edinburgh.
Simpson, W. J. S.	—	The Resurrection and Modern Thought	1911 ..	London.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Author.	Abbreviation.	Title.	Date.	Place.
Smith, D.	—	The Historic Jesus	— ..	London.
Smith, G. A.	—	Modern Criticism and the Old Testament	1901 ..	London.
Smith, J.	—	The Integrity of Scripture	1902 ..	London.
Smith, W. B.	—	Ecce Deus	1912 ..	London.
von Soden, H. ..	Early ..	The History of Early Christian Literature(E.T.)	1906 ..	London.
	Hat	Hat Jesus gelebt?	1910 ..	Berlin.
Somerville, D. ..	—	St. Paul's Conception of Christ	1897 ..	Edinburgh.
Stevens, G. B. ..	—	The Pauline Theology ..	1892 ..	London.
Strauss, D. F. ..	—	The Life of Jesus Critically examined (E.T.)	1846 ..	London.
	—	The Old Path and the New (E.T.)	1874 ..	London.
Swete, H. B. ..	App.	The Appearances of our Lord after the Passion..	1910 ..	London.
	Asc.	The Ascended Christ ..	1911 ..	London.
	Creed	The Apostles' Creed	1905 ..	Cambridge.
Temple, W.	—	The Nature of Personality	1911 ..	London.
Thompson, J. M.	Mark	Jesus according to St. Mark	1910 ..	London.
	Miracles ..	Miracles in the New Testa- ment	1912 ..	London.
	Facts	Through Facts to Faith ..	1912 ..	London.
Ullmann, C.	—	The Sinlessness of Jesus (E.T.)	1858 ..	London.
Underhill, E. ..	—	The Mystic Way	1913 ..	London.
Vischer, E.	—	Die Paulusbrieve	1906 ..	Tübingen.
Walker, W. L. ..	Spirit	The Spirit and the Incar- nation	1899 ..	Edinburgh.
	Christ	The True Christ	1910 ..	London.
Warfield, B. B. ..	—	The Lord of Glory	1907 ..	London.
Warschauer, J. ..	—	Jesus or Christ?	1909 ..	London.
Weinel, H.	Paulus ..	Paulus	1904 ..	Leipzig.
	Jesus	Jesus in neunzehnten Jahrhundert	1907 ..	Tübingen.
	Ist	Ist das "liberale" Jesus- bild widerlegt?	1910 ..	Tübingen.
Weiss, J.	Paul	Paul and Jesus (E.T.) ..	1909 ..	London.
	Christus ..	Christus die Anfänge des Dogmas	1909 ..	Tübingen.
	Jesus	Jesus von Nazareth Mythus oder Geschichte?	1910 ..	Tübingen.
Weiss, B.	—	Biblical Theology of the New Testament (E.T.) ..	1882 ..	Edinburgh.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Author:	Abbreviation:	Title:	Date.	Place.
von Weizsäcker ..	—	The Apostolic Age (E.T.)	1894 ..	London.
Wendland, J. ..	—	Miracles and Christianity (E.T.)	1911 ..	Edinburgh.
Wendt, H. H. ..	Teaching ..	The Teaching of Jesus (E.T.)	1893 ..	Edinburgh.
	John	The Gospel according to St. John (E.T.)	1902 ..	Edinburgh.
Wernle, P.	Beginnings	The Beginnings of Chris- tianity (E.T.)	— ..	London.
	Quellen ..	Die Quellen des Leben Jesu	1906 ..	Tübingen.
	Christ ..	Der Christ und die Sünde bei Paulus	1897 ..	Leipzig.
Westcott, B. F. ..	—	Introduction to the Study of the Gospels	1872 ..	London.
Whittaker, T. ..	—	The Origins of Christianity	1909 ..	London.
Williams, T. R. ..	—	The New Theology	1907 ..	London.
Worsley, F. W. ..	—	The Apocalypse of Jesus ..	1912 ..	London.
Wrede, W.	—	Paulus	1907 ..	Tübingen.
DICTIONARIES, ETC.				
Encyclopaedia				
Biblica	E.Bi. ..	—	1903 ..	London.
Expositor	Exp.	—	1881— ..	London.
Expositor's Greek				
Testament ..	E.G.T. ..	—	1900— ..	London.
Expository Times	Exp. Times	—	1889— ..	Edinburgh.
Hastings, J. B. ..	D.B. ..	Dictionary of the Bible ..	1906 ..	Edinburgh.
Herzog	P.R.E ³ . ..	Realencyklopadie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche	1896-1913	Leipzig.
Hibbert Journal	Hibbert ..	—	1902— ..	London.
Hibbert Journal Supplement ..	Hibb. Supp.	—	1909 ..	London.

INDEX

- Acts, date and author, 36
- Agrapha, 30
- Alexandrianism, in Paul's letters, 54, 119
- Apocalyptic, Late-Jewish, 75
- Apocryphal Gospels, 29
- Body, The Spiritual, 99
- Christ, The Pauline, 76, 95, 104, 109, 120, 127
 - The Primitive (see also under Jesus and Messiah), 104
- Christianity,
 - of Jesus, 134
 - Primitive, 104, 137
- Consciousness, Christ's, 129
- Conversion of Paul, 77
- Criticism,
 - Presuppositions, 5
 - Extravagances, 4
 - and Inspiration, 16
 - and Miracle, 10
 - and Tradition, 21
- Death of Jesus, its meaning, 96, 138
- Development in Paul's Theology, 87
- Divinity of Christ, 106, 109, 118, 123, 127
- Docetism, 90, 125
- Dutch School, 32, 150
- Emperor, worship of, 105
- Epilepsy in Paul, 66
- Epistles or Letters, 62
- Eschatological Interpretation of Christianity, 75, 82, 131
- Evolution and the "World-view," 9
- Ethics of Paul, 84
 - and of Jesus, 92, 136
- Experience the basis of Paul's Theology, 79, 82, 97, 101, 103, 119, 127
- Faith, 138
- Fatherhood and Subordination, 115
- Forgiveness, 96, 137
- Gilgamesh, Epic, 47
- Gnosticism in Paul, 120
- Gospels, their value, 38
- Greek influence on Paul, 52
- Heavenly Man, the, 113
- Hellenism in Paul, 51
- Historical Christ and the Ideal, 116
- Humanity of Jesus, 90
- Idea, Personification of, 116
- Ideal and the real Christ, 116
- Impersonal humanity, 91
- Inspiration and Criticism, 16
- Isaiah in Paul, 75, 95
- Jesus,
 - claims, 129, 132
 - determining element in consciousness, 132

INDEX

- Jesus (*continued*).
 development in Messianic consciousness, 132
 did He exist? 25, 45, 48, 63, 89
 Judge, 130
 known to Paul, 59
 Man, not God, 12
 personification of the Idea, 116
 Pre-existence, 107, 117
 sinlessness, 92
 universalism, 136
 Jesus-cult, Pre-Christian, 45
 John's Gospel,
 author, 43
 value, 44
 Josephus,
 and Luke, 41
 Testimony to Jesus, 27
 Kenosis, 118, 126
 Letters of Paul,
 not Epistles, 62
 authenticity, 33
 order of writing, 34
 Liberal Theology, 38
 Lord, as applied to Jesus, 104
 Hebrew equivalents, 105
 Roman Emperor, 105
 Luke, and Acts, 36
 Gospel, date and value, 41
 Man, the Heavenly, 113
 Mark, Gospel,
 date and value, 38
 Matthew, Gospel,
 date and value, 41
 Messiah,
 Christ's own consciousness, 129, 131
 Jewish, 72
 Pauline, 76, 95
 Miracles and Criticism, 10
 Modern World-view, 9
 Monism, varieties, 7
 Mystery-Religions and Paul, 55
 Mysticism, 45, 70
 Mythical Jesus, 45
 Nature, Uniformity of, 9
 Nazarene, 46
 Nazareth, 46
 Paul,
 Alexandrianism, 54, 119
 apokalyptiker, 82
 chronology of letters, 34
 chronology of life, 64
 coincidences with teaching of Jesus, 92, 136
 conversion, 77
 defects, 67
 epileptic, 66
 excellences, 67
 founder of Christianity, 128, 139
 Gospel, 103, 127
 Hellenism, 51
 knowledge of Jesus, 59
 missionary, 80
 moderation, 67
 mysticism, 70
 not altered Christianity, 138, 139
 personality, 66
 Rabbinism, 50
 Stoicism, 53
 Theologian, 83
 theology based on experience, 79, 82, 97, 101, 103, 119, 127
 universalism, 80, 136
 visions, 79
 zeal, 81
 Pastoral Epistles, 33
 Date, etc., 35
 Personality as a force, 47, 117
 Philo and Paul, 54, 120
 Platonism in Paul, 53, 156
 Prayer to Jesus, 105, 110

INDEX

Pre-existence of Christ, 107, 117	Supernatural in Chris- tianity, 10
Presuppositions, 5, 141	Symbolical Christianity, 25, 116
Q., date and value, 37	Tacitus, his testimony, 26
Rabbinism in Paul, 50	Talmud, references to Jesus, 29
Resurrection of Jesus, importance, 101	Tendency, in the Gospels, 38
Resurrection body, its nature, 99	Tradition, its value, 21
Schmiedel's Pillars, 14	Uniformity of nature, 9
Son of God, applied to Jesus, 109	Value judgment of Christ, 106
Sonship, interpretations, 109	Virgin Birth, the, 90
Spiritual body, 99	Visions of Paul, 79
Stoicism in Paul, 53	World-view, Modern, 9
Subordination of Christ, 123	Worship of Jesus, 105, 110

PRINTED AT BROWNS' SAVILE PRESS,
SAVILE STREET AND GEORGE STREET, HULL.

BS

3650

LTR

453770

Reid, W. Douglass.

Jesus The Christ

Paul The Apostle.

APR 13 '27

DEC 5 '27

DEC 5 '27

FEB 28 '28

Prader #5

O.L. Merritt.

John Merritt

J.H. Branton Feb. 18

APR 29 '27

APR 29 '27

APR 29 '27

APR 30 '32

453770.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO



50 710 093